RB49141

Library

of the

University of Toronto

John Roberts Wincobank 1729

# AN ESSAY CONCERNING Human Understanding.

In Four BOOKS.

Written by *JOHN LOCKE*, Gent.

*The Sixth Edition, with large Additions.*

## VOLUME I.

ECCLES. XI. 5.

*As thou knoweſt not what is the Way of the Spirit, nor how the Bones do grow in the Womb of her that is with Child: Even ſo thou knoweſt not the Works of God, who maketh all things.*

*Quam bellum eſt velle confiteri potius neſcire quod neſcias, quam iſta effutientem nauſeare, atque ipſum ſibi diſplicere!* Cic. de Natur. Deor. l. 1.

*LONDON:*
Printed and Sold by *H. Hills*, and the Bookſellers of *London* and *Weſtminſter*. 1710.

AN

# ESSAY

CONCERNING

# Human Understanding

In Four BOOKS.

Written by JOHN LOCKE, Gent.

The Sixth Edition, with large Additions.

## VOLUME I

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by R. Mill, and the Booksellers of Exeter and Plymouth. 1716.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

# THOMAS

EARL of

*PEMBROKE* and *MONTGOMERY*,

*Baron* Herbert *of* Cardiff, *Lord* Roſs *of* Kendal, Par, Fitzhugh, Marmion, *St.* Quintin, *and* Shurland; *Lord Preſident off his Majeſty's moſt Honourable Privy-Council, and Lord Lieutenant of the County of* Wilts, *and of* South-Wales.

*My LORD,*

THIS Treatiſe, which is grown up under your Lordſhip's Eye, and has ventured into the World by your Order, does now, by a natural kind of Right, come to your Lordſhip for that Protection, which you ſeveral Years ſince promiſed it. 'Tis not that I think any Name, how great ſoever, ſet at the beginning of a Book, will be able to cover the Faults are to be found in it. Things in Print muſt ſtand and fall by their own Worth, or the Reader's Fancy. But there being nothing more to be deſired for Truth, than a fair

unprejudiced Hearing, no Body is more likely to procure me that, than your Lordship, who are allowed to have got so intimate an Acquaintance with her, in her more retired Recesses. Your Lordship is known to have so far advanced your Speculations in the most abstract and general Knowledge of Things, beyond the ordinary Reach, or common Methods, that your Allowance, and Approbation of the Design of this Treatise, will at least preserve it from being condemned without reading; and will prevail to have those Parts a little weighed, which might otherwise, perhaps. be thought to deserve no Consideration, for being somewhat out of the common Road. The Imputation of Novelty, is a terrible Charge amongst those, who judge of Mens Heads, as they do of their Perukes, by the Fashion; and can allow none to be right, but the received Doctrines. Truth scarce ever yet carried it by Vote any where at its first Appearance: New Opinions are always suspected, and usually opposed, without any other Reason, but because they are not already common. But Truth, like Gold, is not the less so, for being newly brought out of the Mine. 'Tis Trial and Examination must give it Price, and not any antick Fashion: And though it be not yet current by the publick Stamp; yet it may, for all that, be as old as Nature, and is certainly not the less genuine. Your Lordship can give great and convincing Instances of this, whenever you please to oblige the Publick with some of those large and comprehensive Discoveries you have made of Truths, hitherto unknown, unless to some few, to whom your Lordship has been pleased not wholly to conceal them. This alone were a sufficient Reason, were there no other, why I should Dedicate this *Essay* to your Lordship; and its having

some

some little Correspondence with some Parts of that nobler and vast System of the Sciences your Lordship has made, so new, exact, and instructive a Draught of, I think it Glory enough, if your Lordship permit me to boast, that here and there I have fallen into some Thoughts not wholly different from yours. If your Lordship think fit, that, by your Encouragement, this should appear in the World, I hope it may be a Reason, some time or other, to lead your Lordship farther; and you will allow me to say, that you here give the World an Earnest of something, that, if they can bear with this, will be truly worth their Expectation. This, my Lord, shews what a Present I here make to your Lordship; just such as the poor Man does to his rich and great Neighbour, by whom the Basket of Flowers, or Fruit, is not ill taken, though he has more plenty of his own Growth, and in much greater Perfection. Worthless Things receive a Value, when they are made the Offerings of Respect, Esteem, and Gratitude: These you have given me so mighty and peculiar Reasons to have, in the highest Degree, for your Lordship, that if they can add a Price to what they go along with, proportionable to their own Greatness, I can with Confidence brag, I here make your Lordship the richest Present you ever received. This I am sure, I am under the greatest Obligation to seek all Occasions to acknowledge a long Train of Favours, I have received from your Lordship; Favours, though great and important in themselves, yet made much more so by the Forwardness, Concern, and Kindness, and other obliging Circumstances, that never failed to accompany them. To all this, you are pleased to add that which gives yet more Weight and Relish to

all the reſt: You vouchſafe to continue me in ſome Degrees of your Eſteem, and allow me a Place in your good Thoughts, I had almoſt ſaid Friendſhip. This, my Lord, your Words and Actions ſo conſtantly ſhew on all Occaſions, even to others when I am abſent, that it is not Vanity in me to mention what every Body knows: But it would be want of good Manners, not to acknowledge what ſo many are Witneſſes of, and every Day tell me, I am indebted to your Lordſhip for. I wiſh they could as eaſily aſſiſt my Gratitude, as they convince me of the great and growing Engagements it has to your Lordſhip. This I am ſure, I ſhould write of the *Underſtanding* without having any, if I were not extreamly ſenſible of them, and did not lay hold on this Opportunity to teſtify to the World, how much I am oblig'd to be, and how much I am,

*Dorſet-Court 24th of May, 1689.*

*My Lord,*

*Your Lordſhip's*

*Moſt Humble, and*

*Moſt Obedient Servant,*

John Locke.

THE

# The Epistle to the Reader.

Reader,

I *Here put into thy Hands, what has been the Diversion of some of my idle and heavy Hours: If it has the good Luck to prove so of any of thine, and thou hast but half so much Pleasure in reading, as I had in writing it, thou wilt as little think thy Money, as I do my Pains, ill bestowed. Mistake not thus, for a Commendation of my Work; nor conclude, because I was pleased with the doing of it, that therefore I am fondly taken with it now it is done. He that hawks at Larks and Sparrows, has no less Sport, though a much less considerable Quarry, than he that flies at nobler Game: And he is little acquainted with the Subject of this Treatise, the* UNDERSTANDING, *who does not know, that as it is the most elevated Faculty of the Soul, so it is employed with a greater, and more constant Delight, than any of the other. Its Searches after Truth, are a sort of Hawking and Hunting, wherein the very Pursuit makes a great part of the Pleasure. Every step the Mind takes in its Progress towards Knowledge, makes some Discovery, which is not only new, but the best too, for the time at least.*

*For the Understanding, like the Eye, judging of Objects only by its own Sight, cannot but be pleased with what it discovers, having less Regret for what has scaped it, because it is unknown. Thus he who has raised himself above the Alms-Basket, and not content to live lazily on Scraps of begg'd Opinions, sets its own Thoughts on Work, to find and follow Truth, will (whatever he*

*lights on) not miss the Hunter's Satisfaction; every Moment of his Pursuit, will reward his Pains with some Delight, and he will have Reason to think his Time not ill spent, even when he cannot much boast of any great Acquisition.*

*Thus, Reader, is the Entertainment of those, who let loose their own Thoughts, and follow them in writing; which thou oughtest not to envy them, since they afford thee an Opportunity of the like Diversion, if thou wilt make use of thy own Thoughts in reading. 'Tis to them, if they are thy own, that I refer my self: But if they are taken upon Trust from others, 'tis no great Matter what they are, they not following Truth, but some meaner Consideration: And 'tis not worth while to be concerned, what he says or thinks, who says or thinks only as he is directed by another. If thou judgest for thy self, I know thou wilt judge candidly; and then I shall not be harmed or offended, whatever be thy Censure. For though it be certain, that there is nothing in this Treatise, of the Truth whereof I am not fully perswaded; yet I consider my self as liable to Mistakes, as I can think thee; and know, that this Book must stand or fall with thee, not by any Opinion I have of it, but thy own. If thou findest little in it new or instructive to thee, thou art not to blame me for it. It was not meant for those that had alredy mastered this Subject, and made a through Acquaintance with their own Understandings; but for my own Information, and the Satisfaction of a few Friends, who acknowledged themselves not to have sufficiently considered it. Were it fit to trouble thee with the History of this Essay, I should tell thee, that five or six Friends meeting at my Chamber, and discoursing on a Subject very remote from this, found themselves quickly at a stand, by the Difficulties that*

*rose*

*rose on every side. After we had a while puzzled our selves, without coming any nearer a Resolution of those Doubts which perplexed us, it came into my Thoughts, that we took a wrong Course; and that, before we set our selves upon Enquiries of that Nature, it was necessary to examine our own Abilities, and see what Objects our Understandings were, or were not fitted to deal with. This I proposed to the Company, who all readily assented; and thereupon it was agreed, that this should be our first Enquiry. Some hasty and undigested Thoughts, on a Subject I had never before considered, which I set down against our next Meeting, gave the first Entrance into this Discourse, which having been thus begun by Chance, was continued by Intreaty; written by incoherent Parcels; and after long Intervals of neglect, resum'd again, as my Humour or Occasions permitted; and at last, in a Retirement, where an Attendance on my Health gave me Leisure, it was brought into that order thou now seest it.*

*This discontinued way of writing, may have occasioned, besides others, two contrary Faults,* viz. *that too little and too much may be said in it. If thou findest any thing wanting, I shall be glad, that what I have writ, gives thee any Desire, that I should have gone farther: If it seems too much to thee, thou must blame the Subject; for when I first put Pen to Paper, I thought all I should have to say on this Matter, would have been contained in one Sheet of Paper; but the farther I went, the larger Prospect I had: New Discoveries led me still on, and so it grew insensibly to the Bulk it now appears in. I will not deny, but possibly it might be reduced to a narrower Compass than it is; and that some Parts of it might be contracted; The way it has been writ in, by Catches, and many long Intervals of Interruption, being*

*apt*

*apt to cause some Repetitions. But to confess the Truth, I am now too lazy, or too busie to make it shorter.*

*I am not ignorant how little I herein consult my own Reputation, when I knowingly let it go with a Fault, so apt to disgust the most Judicious, who are always the nicest Readers. But they who know Sloth is apt to content it self with any Excuse, will pardon me, if mine has prevailed on me, where, I think, I have a very good one. I will not therefore alledge in my Defence, that the same Notion, having different Respects, may be convenient or necessary to prove or illustrate several Parts of the same Discourse; and that so it has happened in many Parts of this: But waving that, I shall frankly avow, that I have sometimes dwelt long upon the same Argument, and expressed it different ways, with a quite different Design. I pretend not to publish this Essay for the Information of Men of large Thoughts and quick Apprehensions; to such Masters of Knowledge, I profess my self a Scholar, and therefore warn them before-hand not to expect any thing here, but what being spun out of my own course Thoughts, is fitted to Men of my own size, to whom, perhaps, it will not be unacceptable, that I have taken some Pains to make plain and familiar to their Thoughts some Truths, which established Prejudice, or the Abstractness of the* Ideas *themselves, might render difficult. Some Objects had need be turned on every side; and when the Notion is new, as I confess some of these are to me, or out of the ordinary Road, as I suspect they will appear to others, 'tis not one simple View of it, that will gain it Admittance into every Understanding, or fix it there with a clear and lasting Impression. There are few, I believe, who have not observed in themselves or others, that what in one way of proposing, was very obscure, another way of expressing it, has made very clear*

*and*

*and intelligible: Though afterward the Mind found little Difference in the Phrases, and wondered why one failed to be understood more than the other. But every thing does not hit alike upon every Man's Imagination. We have our Understandings no less different, than our Palates; and he that thinks the same Truth shall be equally reliſh'd by every one in the same Dress, may as well hope to feast every one with the same sort of Cookery: The Meat may be the same, and the Nourishment good, yet every one not be able to receive it with that Seasoning; and it must be dressed another way, if you will have it go down with some, even of strong Constitutions. The Truth is, those who advised me to publish it, advised me, for this Reason, to publish it as it is: And since I have been brought to let it go abroad, I desire it should be understood by whoever gives himself the Pains to read it. I have so little Affection to be in Print, that if I were not flattered, this Essay might be of some Use to others, as I think it has been to me; I should have confined it to the View of some Friends, who gave the first Occasion to it. My appearing therefore in Print, being on purpose to be as useful as I may, I think it necessary to make what I have to say, as easie and intelligible to all sorts of Readers, as I can. And I had much rather the Speculative and Quick-sighted should complain of my being in some parts tedious, than that any one, not accustomed to abstract Speculations, or prepossessed with different Notions, should mistake, or not comprehend my Meaning.*

*It will possibly be censured as a great piece of Vanity or Insolence in me, to pretend to instruct this our knowing Age, it amounting to little less, when I own, that I publish this Essay with hopes it may be useful to others. But if it may be permitted to speak freely of those, who*

*with*

*with a feigned Modesty condemn as useless, what they themselves write, methinks it savours much more of Vanity or Insolence, to publish a Book for any other End; and he fails very much of that Respect he owes the Publick, who prints, and consequently expects Men should read that, wherein he intends not they should meet with any thing of Use to themselves or others: And should nothing else be found allowable in this Treatise, yet my Design will not cease to be so; and the Goodness of my Intention ought to be some Excuse for the Worthlesness of my Present. 'Tis that chiefly which secures me from the Fear of Censure, which I expect not to escape more than better Writers. Mens Principles, Notions, and Relishes are so different, that it is hard to find a Book which pleases or displeases all Men. I acknowledge the Age we live in, is not the least knowing, and therefore not the most easie to be satisfied. If I have not the good Luck to please, yet no Body ought to be offended with me. I plainly tell all my Readers, except half a dozen, this Treatise was not at first intended for them; and therefore they need not be at the Trouble to be of that Number. But yet if any one thinks fit to be angry, and rail at it, he may do it securely: For I shall find some better way of spending my Time, than in such kind of Conversation. I shall always have the Satisfaction to have aimed sincerely at Truth and Usefulness, though in one of the meanest Ways. The Commonwealth of Learning, is not at this time without Master-Builders, whose mighty Designs, in advancing the Sciences, will leave lasting Monuments to the Admiration of Posterity: But every one must not hope to be a* Boyle, *or a* Sydenham; *and in an Age that produces such Masters, as the Great—* Huygenius, *and the incomparable Mr.* Newton, *with some other of that Strain; 'tis Ambition enough to be employed*

*employed as an Under-Labourer in clearing Ground a little, and removing some of the Rubbish that lies in the way to Knowledge; which certainly had been very much more advanced in the World, if the Endeavours of ingenious and industrious Men had not been much cumbered with the learned, but frivolous Use of uncouth, affected, or unintelligible Terms introduced into the Sciences, and there made an Art of, to that Degree, that Philosophy, which is nothing but the true Knowledge of Things, was thought unfit, or uncapable to be brought into well-bred Company, and polite Conversation. Vague and insignificant Forms of Speech, and Abuse of Language, have so long passed for Mysteries of Science; and hard or misapply'd Words, with little or no Meaning, have, by Prescription, such a Right to be mistaken for deep Learning, and heighth of Speculation, that it will not be easie to perswade, either those who speak, or those who hear them, that they are but the Covers of Ignorance, and Hinderance of true Knowledge. To break in upon the Sanctuary of Vanity and Ignorance, will be, I suppose, some Service to Humane Understanding: Though so few are apt to think, they deceive or are deceived in the Use of Words; or that the Language of the Sect they are of, has any Faults in it, which ought to be examined or corrected, that I hope I shall be pardon'd, if I have in the third Book dwelt long on this Subject; and endeavoured to make it so plain, that neither the Inveterateness of the Mischief, nor the Prevalency of the Fashion, shall be any Excuse for those, who will not take Care about the Meaning of their own Words, and will not suffer the Significancy of their Expressions to be enquired into.*

*I have been told, that a short Epitome of this Treatise, which was printed* 1688, *was by some condemned without reading, because innate* Ideas *were denied in it;*

*it; they too hastily concluding, that if innate* Ideas *were not supposed, there would be little left, either of the Notion or Proof of Spirits. If any one take the like Offence at the Entrance of this Treatise, I shall desire him to read it through; and then I hope he will be convinced, that the taking away false Foundations, is not to the Prejudice, but Advantage of Truth; which is never injur'd or endanger'd so much, as when mixed with, or built on, Falshood. In the Second Edition, I added as followeth:*

*The Bookseller will not forgive me, if I say nothing of this Second Edition, which he has promised, by the Correctness of it, shall make amends for the many Faults committed in the former. He desires too, that it should be known, that it has one whole new Chapter concerning* Identity, *and many Additions and Amendments in other places. These I must inform my Reader are not all new Matter, but most of them either farther Confirmation of what I had said, or Explications to prevent others being mistaken in the Sense of what was formerly printed, and not any Variation in me from it; I must only except the Alterations I have made in Book 2. Chap. 21.*

*What I had there writ concerning* Liberty *and the* Will, *I thought deserv'd as accurate a Review, as I was capable of: Those Subjects having in all Ages exercised the learned part of the World, with Questions and Difficulties, that have not a little perplex'd Morality and Divinity; those parts of Knowledge, that Men are most concern'd to be clear in. Upon a closer Inspection into the working of Mens Minds, and a stricter Examination of those Motives and Views, they are turn'd by, I have found Reason somewhat to alter the Thoughts I formerly had concerning that, which gives the last Determination to the* Will *in all voluntary Actions. This I cannot for-*

bear

*bear to acknowledge to the World, with as much Freedom and Readiness, as I at first published what then seem'd to me to be right, thinking my self more concern'd to quit and renounce any Opinion of my own, than oppose that of another, when Truth appears against it. For 'tis Truth alone I seek, and that will always be welcome to me, when or from whence soever it comes.*

*But what Forwardness soever I have to resign any Opinion I have, or to recede from any thing I have writ, upon the first Evidence of any Error in it; yet thus I must own, that I have not had the good Luck to receive any Light from those Exceptions I have met with in Print against any part of my Book; nor have, from any thing has been urg'd against it, found Reason to alter my Sense, in any of the Points have been question'd. Whether the Subject I have in Hand, requires often more Thought and Attention, than Cursory Readers, at least such as are prepossessed, are willing to allow? Or whether any Obscurity in my Expressions cast a Cloud over it, and these Notions are made difficult to others Apprehension in my way of treating them? So it is, that my Meaning, I find, is often mistaken, and I have not the good Luck to be every where rightly understood. There are so many Instances of this, that I think it Justice to my Reader and my self, to conclude, that either my Book is plainly enough written to be rightly understood by those, who peruse it with that Attention and Indifferency, which every one, who will give himself the Pains to read, ought to imploy in reading; or else that I have writ mine so obscurely, that it is in vain to go about to mend it. Which ever of these be that Truth, 'tis my self, from troubling my Reader with what I think might be said, in answer to those several Objections I have met with, to Passages here and there of my Book. Since I per-*

*swade*

*swade my self, that he who thinks them of Moment enough to be concerned, whether they are true or false, will be able to see, that what is said, is either not well founded, or else not contrary to my Doctrine, when I and my Opposer come both to be well understood.*

*If any, careful that none of their good Thoughts should be lost, have publish'd their Censures of my* Essay, *with this Honour done to it, that they will not suffer it to be an* Essay, *I leave it to the Publick to value the Obligation they have to their critical Pens, and shall not wast my Reader's Time in so idle or ill-natur'd an Employment of mine, as to lessen the Satisfaction any one has in himself, or gives to others in so hasty a Confutation of what I have written.*

*The Booksellers preparing for the fourth Edition of my* Essay, *gave me Notice of it, that I might, if I had leisure, make any Additions or Alterations I should think fit. Whereupon I thought it convenient to advertise the Reader, that besides several Corrections I had made here and there, there was one Alteration which it was necessary to mention, because it ran through the whole Book, and is of Consequence to be rightly understood. What I thereupon said, was this:*

Clear and distinct Ideas, *are Terms, which though familiar and frequent in Mens Mouths, I have Reason to think every one, who uses, does not perfectly understand. And possibly 'tis but here and there one who gives himself the Trouble to consider them so far as to know what he himself or others precisely mean by them: I have therefore in most places chose to put* determinate *or* determined, *instead of* clear *and* distinct, *as more likely to direct Mens Thoughts to my Meaning in this Matter. By those Denominations, I mean some Object in the Mind, and consequently* determined, *i. e. such as*

*it*

*it is there seen and perceived to be. This, I think, may fitly be called a* determinate *or* determined *Idea, when such as it is at any time objectively in the Mind, and so* determined *there, it is annex'd, and without Variation* determined *to a Name or articulate Sound, which is to be steadily the Sign of that very same Object of the Mind, or* determinate *Idea.*

*To explain this a little more particularly. By* determinate, *when applied to a simple Idea, I mean that simple Appearance which the Mind has in its View, or perceives in it self, when that Idea is said to be in it: By* determined, *when applied to a* complex Idea, *I mean such an one as consists of a determinate Number of certain simple or less complex Ideas, join'd in such a Proportion and Situation, as the Mind has before its View, and sees in it self when that Idea is present in it, or should be present in it, when a Man gives a Name to it. I say* should *be: Because it is not every one, nor perhaps any one, who is so careful of his Language, as to use no Word, till he views in his Mind the precise* determined *Idea, which he resolves to make it the Sign of. The want of this, is the Cause of no small Obscurity and Confusion in Mens Thoughts and Discourses.*

*I know there are not Words enough in any Language, to answer all the Variety of Ideas, that enter into Mens Discourses and Reasonings. But this hinders not, but that when any one uses any Term, he may have in his Mind a* determined *Idea, which he makes it the Sign of, and to which he should keep it steadily annex'd, during that present Discourse. Where he does not, or cannot do this, he in vain pretends to* clear or distinct Ideas: *'Tis plain his are not so: And therefore there can be expected nothing but Obscurity and Confusion, where such Terms are made Use of, which have not such a precise Determination.*



*Upon*

*Upon this Ground I have thought* determined *Ideas a way of Speaking less liable to mistake, than* clear *and* distinct : *And where Men have got such* determined *Ideas of all that they reason, enquire, or argue about, they will find a great part of their Doubts and Disputes at an end. The greatest part of the Questions and Controversies that perplex Mankind, depending on the doubtful and uncertain Use of Words, or (which is the same)* indetermined Ideas, *which they are made to stand for. I have made choice of these Terms to signify,* 1. *Some immediate Object of the Mind, which it perceives and has before it distinct from the Sound it uses as a Sign of it.* 2. *That this Idea, thus* determined, *i. e. which the Mind has in it self, and knows, and sees there be* determined *without any Change to that Name, and that Name* determined *to that precise Idea. If Men had such* determined *Ideas in their Enquiries and Discourses, they would both discern how far their own Enquiries and Discourses went, and avoid the greatest part of the Disputes and Wranglings they have with others.*

*Besides this, the Bookseller will think it necessary I should advertise the Reader, that there is an Addition of two Chapters wholly new ; the one* of the Association of Ideas, *the other* of Enthusiasm. *These, with some other larger Additions never before printed, he has engaged to print by themselves after the same manner, and for the same purpose as was done when this* Essay *had the second Impression.*

*In this sixth Edition, there is very little added or altered, the greatest part of what is new, is contained in the* 21 *Chapter of the second Book, which any one, if he thinks it worth the while, may, with a very little Labour, transcribe into the Margent of the former Edition.*

THE

# THE CONTENTS.

## BOOK I.

### *Of* INNATE NOTIONS.


CHAP.

1. *Introduction.*
2. *No innate ſpeculative Principles.*
3. *No innate practical Principles.*
4. *Other Proofs againſt Innate Principles.*


## BOOK II.

### *Of* IDEAS.


CHAP.

1. *Of Ideas in general.*
2. *Of ſimple Ideas.*
3. *Of Ideas of one Senſe.*
4. *Of Solidity.*
5. *Of ſimple Ideas of more than one Senſe.*
6. *Of ſimple Ideas of Reflection.*
7. *Of ſimple Ideas, both of Senſation and Reflection.*
8. *Other Conſiderations concerning ſimple Ideas.*
9. *Of Perception.*
10. *Of Retention.*
11. *Of Diſcerning.*
12. *Of complex Ideas.*
13. *Of Space, and its ſimple Modes.*
14. *Of Duration.*
15. *Of Extenſion and Duration conſidered together.*
16. *Of Number.*
17. *Of Infinity.*
18. *Of other ſimple Modes.*
19. *Of the Modes of Thinking.*
20. *Of the Modes of Pleaſure and Pain.*
21. *Of Power.*
22. *Of mixed Modes.*
23. *Of the complex Ideas of Subſtances.*
24. *Of the collective Ideas of Subſtances.*
25. *Of Relation.*
26. *Of Cauſe and Effect, and other Relations.*
27. *Of Identity and Diverſity.*
28. *Of other Relations.*
29. *Of clear and diſtinct, obſcure and confuſed Ideas,*
30. *Of real and fantaſtical Ideas.*
31. *Of adequate and inadequate Ideas.*
32. *Of true and falſe Ideas.*
33. *Of the Aſſociation of Ideas.*

# THE CONTENTS.

## BOOK I.

### CHAP. I.

*Introduction.*


SECT.

1. *An Enquiry into the Understanding, pleasant and useful.*
2. *Design.*
3. *Method.*
4. *Useful to know the Extent of our Comprehension.*
5. *Our Capacity proportioned to our State and Concerns,* to discover things useful to us.
6. *Knowing the Extent of our Capacities, will hinder us from useless Curiosity, Scepticism, and Idleness.*
7. *Occasion of this Essay.*
8. *What* Idea *stands for.*


### CHAP. II.

*No innate speculative Principles.*


SECT.

1. *The Way shewn how we come by any Knowledge sufficient to prove it not innate.*
2. *General Assent, the great Argument.*
3. *Universal Consent, proves nothing innate.*
4. What is, is; *and,* It is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be, *not universally assented to.*
5. *Not on the Mind naturally imprinted, because not known to Children, Idiots,* &c.
6, 7. *That Men know them when they come to the Use of Reason, answer'd.*
8. *If Reason discovered them, that would not prove them innate.*
9, 11. *'Tis false, that Reason discovers them.*
12. *The coming to the Use of Reason, not the Time we come to know these Maxims.*
13. *By this, they are not distinguished from other knowable Truths.*
14. *If coming to the Use of Reason, were the Time of their Discovery, it would not prove them innate.*
15, 16. *The Steps by which the Mind attains several Truths.*
17. *Assenting as soon as proposed and understood, proves them not innate.*
18. *If such an Assent be a Mark of innate, then that* One and Two are equal to Three; *that Sweetness is not Bitterness; and a Thousand the like must be innate.*


19.

19. *Such less general Propositions known before these universal Maxims.*
20. *One and One, equal to Two,* &c. *not general nor useful, answered.*
21. *These Maxims not being known sometime, till proposed, proves them not innate.*
22. *Implicitly known before proposing, signifies, that the Mind is capable of understanding them, or else signifies nothing.*
23. *The Argument of assenting on first hearing, is upon a false Supposition or no precedent teaching.*
24. *Not innate, because not universally assented to.*
25. *These Maxims not the first known.*
26. *And so not innate.*
27. *Not innate, because they appear least, where what is innate shews it self clearest.*
28. *Recapitulation.*

## CHAP. III.

### *No innate practical Principles.*

SECT.

1. *No moral Principles so clear and so generally received, as the fore-mentioned speculative Maxims.*
2. *Faith and Justice not owned as Principles by all Men.*
3. Obj. *Though Men deny them in their Practice, yet they admit them in their Thoughts, answered.*
4. *Moral Rules need a Proof, ergo not innate.*
5. *Instance in keeping Compacts.*
6. *Virtue generally approved, not because innate, but because profitable.*
7. *Mens Actions convince us, that the Rule of Vertue is not their internal Principle.*
8. *Conscience no Proof of any innate Moral Rule.*
9. *Instances of Enormities practised without Remorse.*
10. *Men have contrary practical Principles.*
11--13. *Whole Nations reject several Moral Rules.*
14. *Those who maintain innate practical Principles, tell us not what they are.*
15--19. *Lord* Herbert's *innate Principles examined.*
20. Obj. *Innate Principles may be corrupted, answered.*
21. *Contrary Principles in the World.*
22-26. *How Men commonly come by their Principles.*
27. *Principles must be examined.*

## CHAP. IV.

### *Other Considerations about innate Principles, both speculative and practical.*

SECT.

1. *Principles not innate, unless their Ideas be innate.*
2, 3. *Ideas, especially those belonging to Principles, not born with Children.*
4, 5. *Identity, an Idea not innate.*
6. *Whole and Part, not innate Ideas.*
7. *Idea of Worship, not innate.*
8--11. *Idea of* GOD, *not innate.*
12. *Suitable to* GOD's *Goodness,*

*ness, that all Men should have an Idea of Him, therefore naturally imprinted by him; answered.*
13--16. *Ideas of* GOD, *various in different Men.*
17. *If the Idea of* GOD *be not innate, no other can be supposed innate.*
18. *Idea of Substance, not innate.*
19. *No Propositions can be innate, since no Ideas are innate.*
20. *No Idea are remember'd, till after they have been introduc'd.*
21. *Principles not innate, because of little Use, or little Certainty.*
22. *Difference of Mens Discoveries depends upon the different Application of their Faculties.*
23. *Men must think and know for themselves.*
24. *Whence the Opinion of innate Principles.*
25. *Conclusion.*

# BOOK II.

## CHAP. I.

### *Of Ideas in general.*

SECT.
1. *Ideas is the Object of Thinking.*
2. *All Ideas come from Sensation or Reflection.*
3. *The Objects of Sensation, one Source of Ideas.*
4. *The Operations of our Minds, the other Source of them.*
5. *All our Ideas are of the one or the other of these.*
6. *Observable in Children.*
7. *Men are differently furnished with these, according to the different Objects they converse with.*
8. *Ideas of Reflection later, because they need Attention.*
9. *The Soul begins to have Ideas when it begins to perceive.*
10. *The Soul thinks not always; for this wants Proofs.*
11. *It is not always conscious of it.*
12. *If a sleeping Man thinks without knowing it, the sleeping and waking Man are two Persons.*
13. *Impossible to convince those that sleep without dreaming, that they think.*
14. *That Men dream without remembering it, in vain urged.*
15. *Upon this Hypothesis, the Thoughts of a sleeping Man ought to be most rational.*
16. *On this Hypothesis the Soul must have Ideas not derived from Sensation or Reflection, of which there is no Appearance.*
17. *If I think when I know it not, no Body else can know it.*
18. *How knows any one that the Soul always thinks? For if it be not a Self-evident Proposition, it needs Proof.*
19. *That a Man should be busie in thinking, and yet not retain it the next Moment, very improbable.*

20--24. *No Ideas but from Senſation or Reflection, evident, if we obſerve Children.*
25. *In the reception of ſimple Ideas, the Underſtanding is moſt of all paſſive.*

CHAP. II.

*Of ſimple Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Uncompounded Appearances.*
2, 3. *The Mind can neither make nor deſtroy them.*

CHAP. III.

*Of Ideas of one Senſe.*

SECT.

1. *As Colours of Seeing, Sounds of Hearing.*
2. *Few ſimple Ideas have Names.*

CHAP. IV.

*Of Solidity.*

SECT.

1. *We receive this Idea from Touch.*
2. *Solidity fills Space.*
3. *Diſtinct from Space.*
4. *From Hardneſs.*
5. *On Solidity depends Impulſe, Reſiſtence, and Protruſion.*
6. *What is it.*

CHAP. V.

*Of ſimple Ideas by more than one Senſe.*

CHAP. VI.

*Of ſimple Ideas of Reflection.*

SECT.

1. *Are the Operations of the Mind about its other Ideas?*
2. *The Idea of Perception, and Idea of Willing, we have from the Reflection.*

CHAP. VII.

*Of ſimple Ideas, both of Senſation and Reflection.*

SECT.

1-6. *Pleaſure and Pain.*
7. *Exiſtence and Unity.*
8. *Power.*
9. *Succeſſion.*
10. *Simple Ideas, the Materials of all our Knowledge.*

CHAP. VIII.

*Other Conſiderations concerning ſimple Ideas.*

SECT.

1--6. *Poſitive Ideas from private Cauſes.*
7, 8. *Ideas in the Mind, Qualities in Bodies.*
9, 10. *Primary and ſecondary Qualities.*
11, 12. *How primary Qualities produce their Ideas.*

13, 14. *How secondary.*
15, 23. *Ideas of primary Qualities, are Resemblances; of secondary, not.*
24, 25. *Reason of our Mistake in this.*
26. *Secondary Qualities twofold; first, Immediately perceivable; secondly, Mediately perceivable.*

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of Perception.*

SECT.

1. *It is the first simple Idea of Reflection.*
2--4. *Perception is only when the Mind receives the Impression.*
5, 6. *Children, though they have Ideas in the Womb, have none innate.*
7. *Which Ideas first is not evident.*
8--10. *Ideas of Sensation often changed by the Judgment.*
11, 14. *Perception puts the Difference between Animals and inferiour Beings.*
15. *Perception, the Inlet of Knowledge.*

## CHAP. X.

### *Of Retention.*

SECT.

1. *Contemplation.*
2. *Memory.*
3. *Attention, Repetition, Pleasure, and Pain, fix Ideas.*
4, 5. *Ideas fade in the Memory.*
6. *Constantly repeated Ideas can scarce be lost.*
7. *In remembering, the Mind is often active.*
8. *Two Defects in the Memory, Oblivion and Slowness.*
10. *Brutes have Memory.*

## CHAP. XI.

### *Of Discerning, &c.*

SECT.

1. *No Knowledge without it.*
2. *The Difference of Wit and Judgment.*
3. *Clearness alone hinders Confusion.*
4. *Comparing.*
5. *Brutes compare but imperfectly.*
6. *Compounding.*
7. *Brutes compound but little.*
8. *Naming.*
9. *Abstraction.*
10, 11. *Brutes abstract not.*
12, 13. *Idiots and mad Men.*
14. *Method.*
15. *These are the Beginnings of Humane Knowledge.*
16. *Appeal to Experience.*
17. *Dark Room.*

## CHAP. XII.

### *Of complex Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Made by the Mind out of simple ones.*
2. *Made voluntarily.*
3. *Are either Modes, Substances, or Relations.*
4. *Modes.*
5. *Simple and mixed Modes.*
6. *Substances single or collective.*
7. *Relation.*
8. *The abstrusest Ideas from the two Sources.*

CHAP.

## CHAP. XIII.

*Of Space, and its simple Modes.*

SECT.

1. *Simple Modes.*
2. *Idea of Space.*
3. *Space and Extension.*
4. *Immensity.*
5, 6. *Figure.*
7, 10. *Place.*
11--14. *Extension and Body not the same.*
15--17. *Substance which we know not, no Proof against Space without Body.*
18, 19. *Substance and Accidents of little use in Philosophy.*
20. *A* Vacuum *beyond the utmost Bounds of Body.*
21. *The Power of Annihilation, proves a* Vacuum.
22. *Motion proves a* Vacuum.
23. *The Ideas of Space and Body distinct.*
24, 25. *Extension being inseparable from Body, proves it not the same.*
26. *Ideas of Space and Solidity distinct.*
27. *Men differ little in clear simple Ideas.*

## CHAP. XIV.

*Of Duration.*

SECT.

1. *Duration is fleeting Extension.*
2--4. *Its Idea from Reflection on the Train of our Ideas.*
5. *The Idea of Duration, applicable to things whilst we sleep.*
6--8. *The Idea of Succession, not from Motion.*
9--11. *The Train of Ideas has a certain Degree of Quickness.*
12. *This Train, the Measure of other Successions.*
13--15. *The Mind cannot fix long on one invariable Idea.*
16. *Ideas, however made, include no Sense of Motion.*
17. *Time is Duration set out by Measures.*
18. *A good Measure of Time must divide its whole Duration into equal Periods.*
19. *The Revolutions of the Sun and Moon, the propereſt Measures of Time.*
20. *But not their Motion, but periodical Appearances.*
21. *No two parts of Duration can be certainly known to be equal.*
22. *Time not the Measure of Motion.*
23. *Minutes, Hours, and Years, not necessary Measures of Duration.*
24. *The Measure of Time two ways applied.*
25--27. *Our Measure of Time applicable to Duration before Time.*
28--31. *Eternity.*

## CHAP. XV.

*Of Duration and Expansion considered together.*

SECT.

1. *Both capable of greater and less.*
2. *Expansion not bounded by Matter.*
3. *Nor Duration by Motion.*
4. *Why Men more easily admit infinite*

*infinite Duration, than infinite Expansion.*
5. *Time to Duration, is as Place to Expansion.*
6. *Time and Place are taken for so much of either as are set out by the Existence and Motion of Bodies.*
7. *Sometimes for so much of either as we design by Measures taken from the Bulk or Motion of Bodies.*
8. *They belong to all Beings.*
9. *All the Parts of Extension, are Extension; and all the Parts of Duration, are Duration.*
10. *Their Parts inseparable.*
11. *Duration is as a Line, Expansion as a Solid.*
12. *Duration has never two Parts together, Expansion altogether.*

CHAP. XVI.

*Of Number.*

SECT.
1. *Number, the simplest and most universal Idea.*
2. *Its Modes made by Addition.*
3. *Each Mode distinct.*
4. *Therefore Demonstrations in Numbers, the most precise.*
5, 6. *Names necessary to Numbers.*
7. *Why Children number not earlier.*
8. *Number measures all Measurables.*

CHAP. XVII.

*Of Infinity.*

SECT.
1. *Infinity in its original Intention, attributed to Space, Duration, and Number.*
2, 3. *How we come by the Idea of Infinity.*
4. *Our Idea of Space boundless.*
5. *And so of Duration.*
6. *Why other Ideas are not capable of Infinity.*
7. *Difference between Infinity of Space, and Space infinite.*
8. *We have no Idea of infinite Space.*
9. *Number affords us the clearest Idea of Infinity.*
10, 11. *Our different Conception of the Infinity of Number, Duration, and Expansion.*
12. *Infinite Divisibility.*
13, 14, 17, 18. *No positive Idea of Infinite.*
15, 16, 19. *What is positive, what negative in our Idea of infinite.*
20. *Some think they have a positive Idea of Eternity, and not Space.*
21. *Supposed positive Ideas of Infinity, Cause of Mistakes.*
22. *All these Ideas from Sensation and Reflection.*

CHAP. XVIII.

*Of other simple Modes.*

SECT.
1, 2. *Modes of Motion.*
3. *Modes of Sounds.*
4. *Modes of Tastes.*
7. *Modes of Colours.*
8. *Why some Modes have, and others have not Names.*

CHAP. XIX.

*Of the Modes of Thinking.*

SECT.

1, 2. *Senſation, Remembrance, Contemplation, &c.*
3. *The various Attention of the Mind in Thinking.*
4. *Hence probable that Thinking is the Action, not Eſſence of the Soul.*

CHAP. XX.

*Of Modes of Pleaſure and Pain.*

SECT.

1. *Pleaſure and Pain ſimple Ideas.*
2. *Good and Evil, what.*
3. *Our Paſſions moved by Good and Evil.*
4. *Love.*
5. *Hatred.*
6. *Deſire.*
7. *Joy.*
8. *Sorrow.*
9. *Hope.*
10. *Fear.*
11. *Deſpair.*
12. *Anger.*
13. *Envy.*
14. *What Paſſions all Men have.*
15, 16. *Pleaſure and Pain, what.*
17. *Shame.*
18. *The Inſtance to ſhew how our Ideas of the Paſſion are got from Senſation and Reflection.*

CHAP. XXI.

*Of Power.*

SECT.

1. *This Idea how got.*
2. *Power active and paſſive.*
3. *Power includes Relatives.*
4. *The cleareſt Idea of active Power had from Spirit.*
5. *Will and Underſtanding, two Powers.*
6. *Faculties.*
7. *Whence the Ideas of Liberty and Neceſſity.*
8. *Liberty, what.*
9. *Suppoſes Underſtanding and Will.*
10. *Belongs not to Volition.*
11. *Voluntary oppoſed to involuntary, not to neceſſary.*
12. *Liberty, what.*
13. *Neceſſity, what.*
14-20. *Liberty belongs not to the Will.*
21. *But to the Agent or Man.*
22-24. *In reſpect of Willing, a Man is not free.*
25, 26, 27 *The Will determined by ſomething without it.*
28. *Volition, what.*
29. *What determines the Will.*
30. *Will and Deſire muſt not be confounded.*
31. *Uneaſineſs determines the Will.*
32. *Deſire is Uneaſineſs.*
33. *The Uneaſineſs of Deſire determines the Will.*
34. *This the Spring of Action.*
35. *The greateſt poſitive Good determines not the Will, but Uneaſineſs.*
36. *Becauſe the Removal of Uneaſineſs is the firſt Step to Happineſs.*
37. *Becauſe Uneaſineſs alone is preſent.*
38. *Becauſe all who allow the Joys of Heaven poſſible, purſue them not. But a great Uneaſineſs is never neglected.*
39. *Deſire accompanies all Uneaſineſs.*

40. *The most pressing Uneasiness naturally determines the Will.*
41. *All desire Happiness.*
42. *Happiness, what.*
43. *What Good is desired, what not.*
44. *Why the greatest Good is not always desired.*
45. *Why not being desired, it moves not the Will.*
46. *Due Consideration raises Desire.*
47. *The Power to suspend the Prosecution of any Desire, makes way for Consideration.*
48. *To be determined by our own Judgment, is no Restraint to Liberty.*
49. *The freest Agents are so determined.*
50. *A constant Determination to a pursuit of Happiness, no Abridgment of Liberty.*
51. *The necessity of pursuing true Happiness, the Foundation of all Liberty.*
52. *The Reason of it.*
53. *Government of our Passions, the right Improvement of Liberty.*
54, 55. *How Men come to pursue different Courses.*
56. *How Men come to chuse Ill.*
57. *First, from Bodily Pains. Secondly, From wrong Desires arising from wrong Judgment.*
58, 59. *Our Judgment of present Good or Evil, always right.*
60. *From a wrong Judgment of what makes a necessary part of their Happiness.*
61, 62. *A more particular Account of wrong Judgments.*
63. *In comparing present and future.*
64, 65. *Causes of this.*
66. *In considering Consequences of Actions.*
67. *Causes of this.*
68. *Wrong Judgment of what is necessary to our Happiness.*
69. *We can change the Agreeableness or Disagreeableness in Things.*
70, 71, 72, 73. *Preference of Vice to Virtue, a manifest wrong Judgment.*

## CHAP. XXII.

### *Of mixed Modes.*

SECT.

1. *Mixed Modes, what.*
2. *Made by the Mind.*
3. *Sometimes got by the Explication of their Names.*
4. *The Name ties the Parts of the mixed Modes into one Idea.*
5. *The Cause of making mixed Modes.*
6. *Why Words in one Language, have none answering in another.*
7. *And Languages change.*
8. *Mixed Modes, where they exist.*
9. *How we get the Ideas of mixed Modes.*
10. *Motion, Thinking, and Power, have been most modified.*
11. *Several Words seeming to signifie Action, signifie but the Effect.*
12. *Mixed Modes, made also of other Ideas.*

## CHAP. XXIII.

*Of the complex Ideas of Substances.*

SECT.

1. *Ideas of Substances how made.*
2. *Our Idea of Substance in general.*
3-6. *Of the sorts of Substances.*
4. *No clear Ideas of Substance in general.*
5. *As clear an Idea of Spirit as Body.*
7. *Powers a great part of our complex Ideas of Substances.*
8. *And why.*
9. *Three sorts of Ideas make our complex ones of Substances.*
10, 11. *The now secondary Qualities of Bodies would disappear, if we could discover the primary ones of their minute Parts.*
12. *Our Faculties of Discovery suited to our State.*
13. *Conjecture about Spirits.*
14. *Complex Ideas of Substances.*
15. *Idea of spiritual Substances, as clear as of bodily Substances.*
16. *No Idea of abstract Substance.*
17. *The Cohesion of solid Parts, and Impulse, the primary Ideas of Body.*
18. *Thinking and* Motivity, *the primary Ideas of Spirit.*
19-21. *Spirits capable of* Motion.
22. *Idea of Soul and Body compared.*
23-27. *Cohesion of solid Parts in Body, as hard to be conceived, as Thinking in a Soul.*
28, 29. *Communication of* Motion *by Impulse, or by Thought, equally intelligible.*
30. *Ideas of Body and Spirit compared.*
31. *The Notion of Spirit involves no more Difficulty in it than that of Body.*
32. *We know nothing beyond our simple Ideas.*
33-35. *Idea of God.*
36. *No Ideas in our Complex one of Spirits, but those got from Sensation or Reflection.*
37. *Recapitulation.*

## CHAP. XXIV.

*Of collective Ideas of Substances.*

SECT.

1. *One Idea.*
2. *Made by the Power of composing in the* Mind
3. *All Artificial Things, are collective Ideas.*

## CHAP. XXV.

*Of Relation.*

SECT.

1. *Relation, what.*
2. *Relations without correlative Terms, not easily perceived.*
3. *Some seemingly absolute Terms contain Relations.*
4. *Relation different from the Things related.*
5. *Change of Relation may be without any Change in the Subject.*
6. *Relation only betwixt two Things.*
7. *All things capable of Relation.*

8.

8. *The Ideas of Relation clearer often than of the Subjects related.*
9. *Relation all terminate in simple Ideas.*
10. *Terms leading the* Mind *beyond the Subject denominated, are Relative.*
11. *Conclusion.*

## CHAP. XXVI.

### *Of Cause of Effect, and other Relations.*

SECT.

1. *Whence their Ideas got.*
2. *Creation, Generation, making Alteration.*
3, 4. *Relations of Time.*
5. *Relations of Place and Extension.*
6. *Absolute Terms often stand for Relations.*

## CHAP. XXVII.

### *Of Identity and Diversity.*

SECT.

1. *Wherein Identity consists.*
2. *Identity of Substances. Identity of Modes.*
3. Principium Individuationis.
4. *Identity of Vegetables.*
5. *Identity of Animals.*
6. *Identity of* Man.
7. *Identity suited to the Idea.*
8. *Same* Man.
9. *Personal Identity.*
10. *Consciousness makes personal Identity.*
11. *Personal Identity in change of Substances.*
12. *Whether in the change of thinking Substances.*
16. *Consciousness makes the same Person.*
17. *Self depends on Consciousness.*
18. *Object of Reward and Punishment.*
21. *Difference between Identity of* Man *and Person.*
23. *Consciousness alone makes self.*
26. *Person a Forensick Term.*
28. *The Difficulty from ill Use of Names.*
29. *Continued Existence, makes Identity.*

## CHAP. XXVIII.

### *Of other Relations.*

SECT.

1. *Proportional.*
2. *Natural.*
3. *Instituted.*
4. *Moral.*
5. *Moral Good and Evil.*
6. *Moral Rules.*
7. *Laws.*
8. *Divine Law, the Measure of Sin and Duty.*
9. *Civil Law, the* Measure *of Crimes and Innocence.*
10, 11. *Philosophical Law, the* Measure *of Virtue and Vice.*
12. *Its Inforcements, Commendation, and Discredit.*
13. *These three Laws, the Rules of moral Good and Evil.*
14, 15. *Morality is the Relation of Actions to the Rules.*
16. *The Denominations of Actions often mislead us.*
17. *Relations innumerable.*
18. *All Relations terminate in simple Ideas.*
19. *We have ordinarily as clear (or clearer) Notion of the Relation, as of its Foundation.*

20. *The Notion of the Relation is the same, whether the Rule any Action is compared to, be true or false.*

## CHAP. XXIX.

### *Of Clear and Distinct, Obscure and Confused Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Ideas, some clear and some distinct, others obscure and confused.*
2. *Clear and Obscure, explained by Sight.*
3. *Causes of Obscurity.*
4. *Distinct and confused, what.*
5. *Objection.*
6. *Confusion of Ideas, is in Reference to their Names.*
7. *Defaults which make Confusion. First, complex Ideas made up of too few simple ones.*
8. *Secondly, Or its simple ones jumbled disorderly together.*
9. *Thirdly, Or are mutable or undetermined.*
10. *Confusion without Reference to Names, hardly conceivable.*
11. *Confusion concerns always two Ideas.*
12. *Causes of Confusion.*
13. *Complex Ideas may be distinct in one Part, and confused in another.*
14. *This, if not heeded, causes Confusion in our Arguings.*
15. *Instances in Eternity.*
16, 17. ——*Divisibility of Matter.*

## CHAP. XXX.

### *Of Real and Fantastical Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Real Ideas are conformable to their Archetypes.*
2. *Simple Ideas all real.*
3. *Complex Ideas are voluntary Combinations.*
4. *Mixed Modes made of consistent Ideas, are real.*
5. *Ideas of Substances are real, when they agree with the Existence of Things.*

## CHAP. XXXI.

### *Of Adequate and Inadequate Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Adequate Ideas, are such as perfectly represent their Archetypes.*
2. *Simple Ideas all adequate.*
3. *Modes are all adequate.*
4, 5. *Modes in Reference to settled Names, may be inadequate.*
6, 7. *Ideas of Substances, as referr'd to real Essences, not adequate.*
8-11. *Ideas of Substances, as Collections of their Qualities, are all inadequate.*
12. *Simple Ideas ἐκμαγεῖα, are adequate.*
13. *Ideas of Substances are ἐκμαγεῖα, inadequate.*
14. *Ideas of Modes and Relations are Archetypes, and cannot but be adequate.*

## CHAP. XXXII.

### *Of true and false Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Truth and Falshood properly belong to Propositions.*
2. *Metaphysical Truth consists a tacit Proposition.*

3. *No Idea as an Appearance in the* Mind *true or false.*
4. *Ideas referred to any thing, may be true or false.*
5. *Other* Mens *Ideas, real Existence, and supposed real Essences, are what* Men *usually refer their Ideas to.*
6--8. *The Cause of such References.*
9. *Simple Ideas may be false in Reference to others of the same Name, but are least liable to be so.*
10. *Ideas of mixed* Modes *most liable to be false in this Sense.*
11. *Or at least to be thought false.*
12. *And why.*
13. *As referred to real Existence, none of our Ideas can be false, but those of Substances.*
14--16. *First, Simple Ideas in this Sense not false, and why.*
15. *Though one* Man's *Idea of Blue should be different from another's.*
17. *Secondly,* Modes *not false.*
18. *Thirdly, Ideas of Substances, when false.*
19. *Truth or Falshood always supposes Affirmation or Negation.*
20. *Ideas in themselves neither true nor false.*
21. *But are false. First, when judged agreeable to another Man's Idea without being so.*
22. *Secondly, When judged to agree to real Existence, when they do not.*
23. *Thirdly, When judged adequate without being so.*
24. *Fourthly, When judged to represent the real Essence.*
25. *Ideas when false.*
26. *More properly to be called Right or Wrong.*
27. *Conclusion.*

## CHAP. XXXIII.

*Of the Association of the Ideas.*

SECT.

1. *Something unreasonable in most* Men.
2. *Not wholly from Self-Love.*
3. *Nor from Education.*
4. *A Degree of* Madness.
5. *From a wrong Connection of Ideas.*
6. *This Connection how made.*
7, 8. *Some Antipathies an Effect of it.*
9. *A great Cause of Errors.*
10--12. *Instances.*
13. *Why Time cures some Disorders in the* Mind, *which Reason cannot.*
14--16. *Farther Instances of the Effects of the Association of Ideas.*
17. *Its Influence on intellectual Habits.*
18. *Observable in different Sects.*

# OF
# Humane Understanding.

## BOOK I. CHAP. I.

### *Introduction.*

§. 1. SInce it is the *Understanding* that sets Man above the rest of sensible Beings and gives him all the Advantage and Dominion, which he has over them; it is certainly a Subject, even for its Nobleness, worth our Labour to enquire into. The Understanding, like the Eye, whilst it makes us see, and perceive all other Things, takes no notice of it self: And it requires Art and Pains to set it at a Distance, and make it its own Object. But whatever be the Difficulties, that lye in the way of this Enquiry; whatever it be, that keeps us so much in the Dark to our selves; sure I am, that all the Light we can let in upon our own Minds; all the Acquaintance we can make with our own Understandings, will not only be very Pleasant, but bring us great Advantage, in directing our Thoughts in the search of other Things. *An Enquiry into the Understanding, Pleasant and Useful.*

§. 2. This, therefore, being my *Purpose* to enquire into the Original, Certainty, and Extent of Humane Knowledge; together, with the Grounds and Degrees of Belief, Opinion, and Assent; I shall not at present meddle with the Phisical Consideration of the Mind; or trouble my self to Examine, wherein its Essence consists, or by what Motions of our Spirits, or Alterations of our Bodies, we come to have any Sensation by our Organs, or any *Ideas* in our Understandings; and whether those *Ideas* do in their Formation, any, or all of them, depend on Matter or no. These are Speculations, which, however Curious and Entertaining, I shall decline as lying out of my Way, in the Design I am now upon. It shall suffice to my present Purpose, to consider the discerning Faculties of a Man, *Design.*

as they are employ'd about the Objects, which they have to do with: And I shall imagine I have not wholly misemploy'd myself in the Thoughts I shall have on this Occasion, if, in this Historical, plain Method, I can give any Account of the Ways, whereby our Understandings come to attain those Notions of Things we have, and can set down any Measures of the Certainty of our Knowledge, or the Grounds of those Perswasions, which are to be found amongst Men, so Various, Different, and wholly Contradictory; and yet Asserted somewhere or other with such Assurance and Confidence, that he that shall take a view of the Opinions of Mankind, observe their Opposition, and at the same time, consider the Fondness, and Devotion wherewith they are embrac'd; the Resolution and Eagerness, wherewith they are maintain'd, may perhaps have Reason to suspect, that either there is no such thing as Truth at all; or that Mankind hath no sufficient Means to attain a certain Knowledge of it.

*Method.*

§. 3. It is therefore worth while, to search out the *Bounds* between Opinion and Knowledge; and examine by what Measures, in things, whereof we have no certain Knowledge, we ought to regulate our Assent, and moderate our Perswasions. In Order whereunto, I shall pursue this following Method.

*First*, I shall enquire into the *Original* of those *Ideas*, Notions, or whatever else you please to call them, which a Man observes, and is conscious to himself he has in his Mind; and the ways whereby the Understanding comes to be furnished with them.

*Secondly*, I shall endeavour to shew, what *Knowledge* the Understanding hath by those *Ideas*; and the Certainty, Evidence, and Extent of it.

*Thirdly*, I shall make some Enquiry into the Nature and Grounds of *Faith* or *Opinion*; whereby I mean that Assent, which we give to any Proposition as true, of whose Truth yet we have no certain Knowledge: And here we shall have Occasion to examine the Reasons and Degrees of *Assent*.

*Useful to know the extent of our Comprehension.*

§. 4. If by this Enquiry into the Nature of the Understanding, I can discover the Powers thereof; *how far* they reach; to what things they are in any Degree proportionate; and where they fail us, I suppose it may be of use, to prevail with the busy Mind of Man to be more cautious in meddling with things exceeding its Comprehension; to stop, when it is at the utmost Extent of its Tether; and to sit down in a quiet Ignorance of those Things, which, upon Examination, are found to be

be beyond the reach of our Capacities. We should not then perhaps be so forward, out of an Affectation of an universal Knowledge, to raise Questions, and perplex our selves and others with Disputes about Things, to which our Understandings are not suited; and of which we cannot frame in our Minds any clear or distinct Perceptions, or whereof (as it has perhaps too often happen'd) we have not any Notions at all. If we can find out, how far the Understanding can extend its view; how far it has Faculties to attain Certainty; and in what Cases it can only Judge and Guess, we may learn to content our selves with what is attainable by us in this State.

*Our Capacity suited to our State and Concerns.*

§. 5. For though the *Comprehension* of our Understandings, comes exceeding short of the vast Extent of things; yet, we shall have Cause enough to magnify the bountiful Author of our Being, for that Portion and Degree of Knowledge, he has bestowed on us, so far above all the rest of the Inhabitants of this our Mansion. Men have Reason to be well satisfied with what God hath thought fit for them, since he has give them (as St. *Peter* says, πάντα πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν, Whatsoever is necessary for the Conveniencies of Life, and Information of Vertue; and has put within the reach of their Discovery the comfortable Provision for this Life and the Way that leads to a better. How short soever their Knowledge may come of an universal or perfect Comprehension of whatsoever is, it yet secures their great Concernments that they have Light enough to lead them to the Knowledge of their Maker, and the sight of their own Duties. Men may find Matter sufficient to busy their Heads, and employ their Hands with Variety, Delight, and Satisfaction; if they will not boldly quarrel with their own Constitution, and throw away the Blessings their Hands are fill'd with, because they are not big enough to grasp every thing. We shall not have much Reason to complain of the narrowness of our Minds, if we will but employ them about what may be of use to us; for of that they are very capable: And it will be an Unpardonable, as well as Childish Peevishness, if we undervalue the Advantages of our Knowledge, and neglect to improve it to the Ends for which it was given us, because there are some Things that are set out of the reach of it. It will be no Excuse to an Idle and Untoward Servant, who would not attend his Business by Candle-light, to plead that he had not broad Sun-shine. The Candle, that is set up in us, shines bright enough for all our Purposes. The Discoveries we can make with this, ought to satisfy us: And we

shall then use our Understandings right, when we entertain all Objects in that Way and Proportion, that they are suited to our Faculties; and upon those Grounds, they are capable of being propos'd to us; and not peremptorily, or intemperately require Demonstration, and demand Certainty, where Probability only is to be had, and which is sufficient to govern all our Concernments. If we will dis-believe every thing, because we cannot certainly know all things; we shall do much-what as wisely as he, who would not use his Legs, but sit still and Perish, because he had no Wings to Fly.

*Knowledge of our Capacity a cure of Scepticism and Idleness.*

§. 6. When we know our own *Strength*, we shall the better know what to undertake with hopes of Success: And when we have well survey'd the *Powers* of our own Minds, and made some Estimate what we may expect from them, we shall not be inclined either to sit still, and not set our Thoughts on Work at all, in Dispair of knowing any thing; nor on the other side, question every thing, and disclaim all Knowledge, because some Things are not to be Understood. 'Tis of great use to the Sailor to know the length of his Line, though he cannot with it fathom all the Dephts of the Ocean. 'Tis well he knows, that it is long enough to reach the Bottom, at such Places, as are necessary to direct his Voyage, and caution him against running upon Shoals, that may ruin him. Our Business here is not to know all Things, but those which concern our Conduct. If we can find out those Measures, whereby a Rational Creature put in that State, which Man is in, in this World, may, and ought to govern his Opinions and Actions depending thereon, we need not be troubled, that some other things escape our Knowledge.

*Occasion of this Essay.*

§. 7. This was that which gave the first *Rise* to this *Essay* concerning the *Understanding*. For I thought that the first Step towards satisfying several Enquiries, the Mind of Man was very apt to run into, was, to take a Survey of our own Understandings, examine our own Powers, and see to what Things they were adapted. Till that was done, I suspected we began at the wrong end, and in vain sought for Satisfaction in a quiet and sure Possession of Truths, that most concern'd us, whilst we let loose our Thoughts into the vast Ocean of *Being*, as if all that boundless Extent, were the natural and undoubted Possession of our Understandings, wherein there was nothing exempt from its Decisions, or that escaped its Comprehension. Thus Men, extending their Enquiries

quiries beyond their Capacities, and letting their Thoughts wander into those Depths, where they can find no sure Footing; 'tis no Wonder, that they raise Questions, and multiply Disputes, which never coming to any clear Resolution, are proper only to continue and increase their Doubts, and to confirm them at last in perfect Scepticism. Whereas were the Capacities of our Understandings well considered, the Extent of our Knowledge once discovered, and the Horizon found, which sets the Bounds between the enlightned and dark Parts of Things; between what is, and what is not comprehensible by us, Men would perhaps with less scruple acquiesce in the avow'd Ignorance of the one, and imploy their Thoughts and Discourse, with more Advantage and Satisfaction in the other.

*What* Idea *stands for.*

§. 8. Thus much I though necessary to say concerning the Occasion of this Enquiry into Humane Understanding. But, before I proceed on to what I have thought on this Subject, I must here in the Entrance beg Pardon of my Reader, for the frequent use of the Word *Idea*, which he will find in the following Treatise. It being that Term, which, I think, serves best to stand for whatsoever is the Object of the Understanding, when a Man thinks, I have used it to express whatever is meant by *Phantasm*, *Notion*, *Species*, or whatever it is, which the Mind can be employ'd about in thinking; and I could not avoid frequently using it. (1)

I presume it will be easily granted me, that there are such *Ideas* in Mens Minds; every one is conscious of them in himself, and Mens Words and Actions will satisfy him, that they are in others.

Our first Enquiry then shall be, how they come into the Mind.

---

(1) This modest Apology of our Author could not procure him the free use of the Word *Idea*. But great offence has been taken at it, and it has been censured as of dangerous Consequence: To which you may here see what he Answers. *The World*, * saith the Bishop of *Worcester*, *hath been* ' strangely amused with ' *Ideas* of late; and we have been told, that strange things ' might be done by the help of *Ideas*; and yet these *Ideas*, ' at last, come to be only common Notions of Things, which ' we must make use of in our Reasoning. You (*i. e.* the Author of the ' *Essay* concerning *Humane Understanding*) say in that Chapter, about the ' Existence of God, you thought it most proper to express your self, in the ' most usual and familiar way, by common Words and Expressions. I would ' you had done so quite through your Book; for then you had never given ' that Occasion, to the Enemies of our Faith, to take up your new way of ' *Ideas*,

* *Answer to Mr.* Locke's *First Letter*, p. 93.

'*Ideas*, as an effectual Battery (as they imagin'd) against the Mysteries of 'the Christian Faith. But you might have enjoy'd the satisfaction of your '*Ideas* long enough before I had taken notice of them, unless I had found 'them imployed about doing Mischief.

To which our Author (†) Replies, 'Tis plain, that that which your Lordship apprehends in my Book, may be of dangerous Consequence to the Article which your Lordship has endeavoured to Defend, is my introducing *news Terms*; that which your Lordship instances in, is that of *Ideas*. And the reason your Lordship gives, in every of these places, why your Lordship as such an apprehension of *Ideas*, that they may be of dangerous Consequence to that Article of Faith, which your Lordship has endeavoured to Defend, is because they have been applied to such Purposes. And I might (your Lordship says) have enjoyed the satisfaction of my *Ideas* long enough, before you had taken notice of them, unless your Lordship had found them employed in doing Mischief. Which, at last, as I humbly conceive, amounts to thus much, and no more, *viz.* That your Lordship fears *Ideas*, *i. e.* the term *Ideas*, may, sometime or other, prove of very dangerous Consequence, to what your Lordship has endeavoured to Defend, because they have been made use of, in Arguing against it. For, I am sure, your Lordship does not mean, that you apprehended the Things, signified by *Ideas*, may be of dangerous Consequence to the Article of Faith, your Lordship endeavours to Defend, because they have been made use of against it: For (besides that your Lordship mentions *Terms*) that would be to expect that those who oppose that Article, should oppose it without any Thoughts; for the thing signified by *Ideas*, is noting but the immediate Objects of our Minds in thinking: So that unless any one can Oppose the Article your Lordship Defends, without thinking on something, he must use the things signified by *Ideas*; for he that thinks, must have some immediate Object of his Mind in thinking, *i. e.* must have *Ideas*.

† *In his Second Letter to the Bishop of Worcester, p. 63, &c.*

But whether it be the Name or the Thing; *Ideas* in Sound, or *Ideas* in Signification, that your Lordship apprehends, *may be of dangerous Consequence to that Article of Faith, which your Lordship endeavors to Defend:* It seems to me, I will not say a *New way* of *Reasoning*, (for that belongs to me) but were it not your Lordships, I should think it a very extraordinary way of *Reasoning*, to Write against a Book, wherein your Lordship acknowledges, they are not used to bad Purposes, nor employed to do Mischief; only because that you find that *Ideas* are by those who oppose your Lordship, *imploy'd to do Mischief*; and so apprehend, *they may be of dangerous Consequence* to the Article your Lordship has engaged in the Defense of. For whether *Ideas* as *Terms*, or *Ideas* as the immediate Objects of the Mind signified by those *Terms*, may be, in your Lordships apprehension, *of dangerous Consequence to that Article*; I do not see how your Lordships Writing against the *Notions of Ideas*, as stated in my Book, will at all hinder your Opposers *from imploying them in doing Mischief*, as before.

However, be that as it will, so it is, that your Lordship apprehends these *New Terms*, these *Ideas with which the World hath, of late, been so strange-*

ly

*ly amazed, (though at last they come to be only common Notion of Things,* as your Lordship owns) *may be of dangerous Consequence* to that Article.

My Lord, if any, in their Answer to your Lordships *Sermons*, and in their other *Pamphlets*, wherein your Lordship complains they have talk'd so much of *Ideas*, have been troublesome to your Lordship with that *Term*; it is not strange that your Lordship should be tired with that sound: But how natural soever it be to our weak Constitutions, to be offended with any sound, wherewith an importunate Din hath been made about our Ears: Yet, My Lord, I know your Lordship has a better Opinion of the Articles of our Faith, than to think any of them can be over-turn'd, or so much as shaken, with a Breath, formed into any Sound, or *Term* whatsoever.

Names are but the arbitrary Marks of Conception; and so they be sufficiently appropriated to them in their use; I know no other difference any of them have in particular, but as they are of easy or difficult Pronounciation, and of a more or less pleasant Sound; and what particular Antipathies there may be in Men, to some of them upon that account, is not easie to be foreseen. This I am sure, no *Term* whatsoever in it self bears, one more than another, any opposition to Truth of any kind; they are only Propositions that do or can oppose the Truth of any Article or Doctrine: And thus no *Term* is priviledg'd from being set in opposition to Truth.

There is no Word to be found, which may not be brought into a Proposition, wherein the most sacred and most evident Truths may be opposed; but that is not a fault in the *Term*, but him that uses it. And therefore I cannot easily persuade my self (whatever your Lordship hath said in the heat of your Concern) that you have bestowed so much Pains upon my Book, because the Word *Idea* is so much used there. For though upon my saying, in my Chapter about the Existence of God, 'That I scarce use the Word 'Idea in that Chapter; your Lordship wishes, that *I had done so quite 'through my Book*: Yet, I must rather look upon that as a Compliment to me, wherein your Lordship wished, that my Book had been all through suited to vulgar Readers, not used to that and the like *Terms*, than that your Lordship has such an apprehension of the Word *Idea*; or that there is any such harm in the use of it, instead of the Word *Notion* (with which your Lorship seems to take it to agree in Signification) that your Lordship would think it worth your while to spend any part of your valuable Time and Thoughts about my Book, for having the Word *Idea* so often in it; for this would be to make your Lordship to Write only against an impropriety of Speech. I own to your Lordship, it is a great Condescension in your Lordship to have done it, if that Word have such a share in what your Lorship has Writ against my Book, as some Expressions would perswade one; and I would, for the satisfaction of your Lordship, change the *Term* of *Idea* for a better, if your Lordship, or any one, could help me to it. For that *Notion* will not so well stand for every immediate Object of the Mind in thinking, as *Idea* does, (I have as I guess) somewhere given a reason in my Book, by shewing that the term *Notion* is more peculiarly appropriated to a certain sort of those Objects, which I call mixed Modes: And, I think, it would not sound altogether so well, to say, the *Notion of Red*,

and the *Notion of a Horse*; as the *Idea of Red*, and the *Idea of a Horse*. But if any one thinks it will, I contend not; for I have no Fondneſs for, no Antipathy to any particular articulate Sounds: Nor do I think there is any Spell or Faſcination in any of them.

But the Word *Idea* proper or improper, I do not ſee how it is the better or the worſe, becauſe *Ill-Men* have made uſe of it, or becauſe it has been made uſe of to *Bad Purpoſes*; for if that be a reaſon to condemn, or lay it by, we muſt lay by the Terms *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, *Perception*, *Diſtinct*, *Clear*, &c. Nay, the Name of *God* himſelf will not ſcape; for I do not think any one of thoſe, or any other Term, can be produced, which has not been made uſe of by ſuch Men, and to ſuch Purpoſes. And therefore, if *the* Unitarians, *in their late Pamphlets, have talked very much of, and ſtrangely amuzed the World with Ideas*: I cannot believe your Lordſhip will think that Word one jot the worſe, or the more dangerous, becauſe they uſe it; any more than, for their uſe of them, you will think *Reaſon* or *Scripture*, Terms ill or dangerous. And therefore what your Lordſhip ſays in the bottom of this 93d page, that *I might have enjoyed the ſatisfaction of my* Ideas *long enough before your Lordſhip had taken notice of them*, unleſs you had found them imployed in doing Miſchief; will, I preſume, when your Lordſhip has conſider'd again of this matter, prevail with your Lordſhip, to let me *enjoy* ſtill the *ſatisfaction I take in my Ideas, i. e.* as much ſatisfaction as I can take in ſo ſmall a matter, as is the uſing of a proper term, notwithſtanding it *ſhould be employ'd, by others in doing Miſchief*.

For, my Lord, If I ſhould leave it wholly out of my Book, and ſubſtitute the Word *Notion* every where in the room of it; and every body elſe do ſo too, (though your Lordſhip does not, I ſuppoſe, ſuſpect, that I have the Vanity to think they would follow my Example) my Book would, it ſeems, be the more to your Lordſhips liking; but I do not ſee how this would one jot abate the *Miſchief*, your Lordſhip complains of. For the *Unitarians* might as much employ *Notions*, as they do now *Ideas*, to do *Miſchief*; unleſs they are ſuch Fools to think they can conjure with this notable Word *Idea*; and that the force of what they ſay, lies in the Sound, and not in the ſignification of their Terms.

This, I am ſure, that the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion, can be no more batter'd by one Word than another; nor can they be beaten down nor endanger'd, by any ſound whatſoever. And I am apt to flatter my ſelf, that your Lordſhip is ſatisfied that there is no harm in the Word *Ideas*, becauſe you ſay, you ſhould not have taken any notice of my *Ideas*, if the *Enemies of our Faith had not taken up my new way of* Ideas, *as an effectual Battery againſt the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith*. In which place, *by new way of Ideas*, nothing, I think, can be conſtrued to be meant, but my expreſſing my ſelf by that of *Ideas*; and not by other more common Words, and of ancienter ſtanding in the *Engliſh* Language.

As to the Objection, of the Author's way by *Ideas* being *a new way*, He thus Anſwers: *My new way of Ideas*, or *my way by Ideas*, which often occurs in your Lordſhips Letter, is, I confeſs, a very large and doubtful Expreſſion; and may, in the full latitude, comprehend my whole *Eſſay*; becauſe

becauſe treating in it of the *Underſtanding*; which is nothing but the faculty of Thinking, I could not well treat of that faculty of the Mind, which conſiſts in Thinking, without conſidering the immediate Objects of the Mind in Thinking, which I call *Ideas*: And therefore in treating of the *Underſtanding*, I gueſs it will not be thought ſtrange, that the greateſt part of my Book has been taken up, in conſidering what theſe Objects of the Mind, in Thinking, are; whence they come; what uſe the Mind makes of them, in its ſeveral ways of Thinking; and what are the outward Marks, whereby it ſignifies them to others, or records them for its own uſe. And this, in ſhort, is *my way by Ideas*, that which your Lordſhip calls *my new way by Ideas*: Which, my Lord, if it be *new*, it is but a new Hiſtory of an old Thing. For I think it will not be doubted, that Men always perform'd the Actions of *Thinking*, *Reaſoning*, *Believing*, and *Knowing*, juſt after the ſame manner that they do now: Though whether the ſame Account has heretofore been given of the way how they performed theſe Actions, or wherein they conſiſted, I do not know. Were I as well read as your Lordſhip, I ſhould have been ſafe from that gentle Reprimand of your Lordſhips, for thinking *my way of Ideas N E W, for want of looking into other Mens Thoughts, which appear in their Books.*

Your Lordſhips Words, as an Acknowledgement of your Inſtructions in the Caſe; and as a warning to others, who will be ſo bold Adventurers as *to Spin any thing barely out of their own Thoughts*, I ſhall ſet down at large: And they run thus. *Whether you took this way of* Ideas *from the Modern Philoſopher, mention'd by you, is not all Material; but I intended no Reflection upon you in it. (for that you mean by my commending you as a Scholar of ſo great a Maſter) I never meant to take from you the Honour of your own Inventions: And I do believe you, when you ſay, That you Wrote from your own Thoughts, and the* Ideas *you had there. But many thing may ſeem New to one, that converſes only with his own Thoughts, which really are not ſo; as he may find, when he looks into the Thoughts of other Men, which appear in their Books. And therefore although I have a juſt eſteem for the Invention of ſuch, who can ſpin Volumes barely out of their own Thoughts; yet I am apt to think, they would oblige the World more, if after they have thought ſo much themſelves, they would examine what Thoughts others have had before them, concerning the ſame things; that ſo thoſe may not be thought their own Inventions, which are common to themſelves and others. If a Man ſhould try all the Magnetical Experiments himſelf, and publiſh them as his own Thoughts, he might take himſelf to be the Inventor of them: But he that examines and compares them with what* Gibbert, *and others have done before him, will not diminiſh the Praiſe of his Diligence, but may wiſh he had compared his Thoughts with other Mens; by which the World would receive greater Advantage, altho' he loſt the Honour of being an Original.*

To alleviate my Fault herein, I agree with your Lordſhip, that *many things may ſeem N E W, to one that converſes only with his own Thoughts, which really are not ſo*: But I muſt crave leave to ſuggeſt to your Lordſhip, That if in ſpinning of them out of his own Thoughts, they *ſeem* new to him, he is certainly the Inventor of them; and they may as juſtly be thought

thought *his own Invention*, as any ones; and he is as certainly the *Inventor* of them, as any one who thought on them before him: The distinction of Invention, or not Invention, lying not in thinking first, or not first, but in borrowing, or not borrowing your Thoughts from another: And he to whom, spinning them out of his own Thoughts, they *seem new*, could not certainly borrow them from another. So he truly Invented *Printing* in *Europe*, who without any communication with the *Chineses*, spun it out of his own Thoughts; though it was never so true, that the *Chineses* had the use of *Printing*, nay, of *Printing* in the very same way, among them, many Ages before him. So that he that spins any thing out of his own Thoughts, that *seems new to him*, cannot cease to think it his own Invention. Should he *examine* never so far, *what Thoughts others have had before him, concerning the same thing*, and should find, by examining, that they had the same Thoughts too.

But what great *obligation this would* be to the World, or weighty cause of turning over and looking into Books; I confess I do not see. The great end to me, in conversing with my own or other Mens Thoughts, in matters of Speculation, is to find Truth, without being much concerned whether my own spinning of it out of mine, or their spinning of it out of their own Thoughts, helps me to it. And how little I affect the *Honour of an Original*, may be seen in that place of my Book, where if any where, that Itch of Vain-glory was likliest to have shewn it self, had I been so over-run with it, as to need a cure. It is where I speak of certainty, in these following Words, taken notice of by your Lordship, in another place: 'I think I 'have shewn wherein it is that certainty, real certainty consist, which what-'ever it was to others, was, I confess, to me heretofore, one of those *desi-'derata*, which I found great want of.

Here, my Lord, however *New* this *seem'd* to me, and the more so because possibly I had in vain hunted for it in the *Books of others*; yet I spoke of it as *New*, only to my self; leaving *others*, in the undisturb'd Possession of what either by Invention, or Reading, was theirs before, without assuming to my self any other Honour, but that of my own Ignorance, till that time, if others before had shewn wherein Certainty lay. And yet, my Lord, If I had upon this occasion, been forward to assume to my self the *Honour of an Original*, I think I had been pretty safe in it; since I should have had your Lordship for my Guarantee and *Vindicator* in that Point who are pleased to call it *New*; and as such, to Write against it.

And truly, my Lord, in this respect, my Book has had very unlucky Stars, since it hath had the misfortune to displease your Lordship, with many things in it, for their Novelty; as *new way of Reasoning*; *new Hypotheses about Reason*; *new sort of Certainty*; *new Terms*; *new way of Ideas*; *new Method of Certainty*, &c. And yet in other places your Lordship seems to think, it worthy in me of your Lordships Reflection, for saying, but what others have said before. As where I say, 'In the differene 'make of Mens Tempers, and application of their Thoughts, some Argu-'ments prevail more on one, and some on another, for the confirmation of 'the same Truth. Your Lordship asks, *What is this different from what*

*all Men of Understanding have said?* Again, I take it, your Lordship meant not these Words for a Commendation for my Book, where you say; *But if no more be meant by* 'The simple *Ideas* that come in by Sensation 'or Reflection, and their being the foundation of our Knowledge, *but that our Notions of Things come in, either from our Senses, or the exercise of our Minds: As there is nothing extraordinary in the Discovery, so your Lordship is far enough from opposing that, wherein you think all Mankind are agreed.*

And again, *But what need all this great Noise about* Ideas *and* Certainty, *true and real* Certainty *by* Ideas; *if, after all, it comes only to this, that our* Ideas *only represent to us such things, from whence we bring Arguments to prove the truth of things.*

But, *The World hath been strangely amused with* Ideas *of late; and we have been told, that strange things might be done by the help of* Ideas, *and yet these* Ideas, *at last, come to be only common Notions of things, which we must make use of in our Reasoning.* And to the like purpose in other places.

Whether, therefore, at last, your Lordship will resolve, that it is *New* or no; or more faulty by its being *New*, must be left to your Lordship. This I find by it, that my Book cannot avoid being Condemned on the one side, or the other; nor do I see a possibility to help it. If there be Readers that like only *New* Thoughts; or, on the other side, others that can bear nothing but what can be justified by received Authorities in Print; I must desire them to make themselves amends in that part which they like, for the displeasure they receive in the other: But if many should be so exact, as to find fault with both, truly I know not well what to say to them. The Case is a plain Case, the Book is all over naught, and there is not a Sentence in it, that is not, either from its Antiquity or Novelty, to be Condemned; and so there is a short end of it. From your Lordship indeed in particular, I can hope for something better; for your Lordship thinks the *general design of it so good*, that that, I flatter my self, would prevail on your Lordship, to preserve it from the Fire.

But as to the way your Lordship thinks, I should have taken to prevent the *having it thought my Invention, when it was common to me with others*, it unluckily so fell out, in the subject of my *Essay of Humane Understanding*, that I could not look into the Thoughts of other Men to inform my self. For my design being, as well as I could, to copy Nature, and to give an account of the Operations of the Mind in Thinking; I could look into no bodies Understanding but my own, to see how it wrought; nor have a prospect into other Mens Minds, to view their Thoughts there; and observe what Steps and Motions they took, and by what gradations they proceeded in their acquainting themselves with Truth, and their advance to Knowledge: What we find in their Thoughts in Books, is but the result of this, and not the progress and working of their Minds, in coming to the Opinions or Conclusions they set down and Published.

All therefore, that I can say of my Book, is, That it is a Copy of my own Mind, in its several ways of Operation. And all that I can say for the publishing

publishing of it, is, That I think the Intellectual Faculties are made, and operate alike in most Men, and that some, that I shewed it to before I published it, liked it so well, that I was confirmed in that Opinion. And therefore, if it should happen, that it should not be so, but that some Men should have ways of Thinking, Reasoning, or arriving at Certainty, different from others, and above those that I find my Mind to use and acquiesce in, I do not see of what use my Book can be to them. I can only make it my humble Request, in my own Name, and in the Name of those that are of my Size, who find their Minds Work, Reason, and know in the same low way that mine does, that those Men of a more happy Genius, would shew us the way of their nobler Flights; and particularly would discover to us their shorter or surer way to Certainty, than by *Ideas*, and the observing their agreement or disagreement.

Your Lordship adds, *But now it seems, nothing is Intelligible but what suits with the new way of* Ideas. My Lord, *The new way of* Ideas, and the old way of speaking *Intelligibly* (†) was always, and ever will be the same: And if I may take the liberty to declare my sense of it, herein it consists. 1. That a Man use no Words, but such as he makes the signs of certain determined Objects of his Mind in Thinking, which he can make know to another. 2. Next, That he use the same Word steadily, for the sign of the same immediate Object of his Mind in Thinking. 3. That he join these Words together in Propositions, according to the Grammatical Rules of that Language he speaks in. 4. That he unite those Sentences in a Coherent Discourse. Thus and thus only I humbly conceive, any one may preserve himself from the confines and suspicion of Jargon, whether he pleases to call these immediate Objects of his Mind, which his Words do, or should stand for, *Ideas* or no.

† *Mr.* Locke's *Third Letter to the Bishop of* Worcester, p. 353, &c.

## CHAP. II.

### *No Innate Principles in the Mind.*

*The way shewn how we come by any Knowledge, sufficient to prove it not Innate.*

§. 1. IT is an Eſtabliſhed Opinion amongſt ſome Men, That there are in the *Underſtanding* certain *Innate Principles*; ſome Primary Notions, Κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι, Characters, as it were Stamped upon the Mind of Man, which the Soul receives in its very firſt Being; and brings into the World with it. It would be ſufficient to Convince unprejudiced Readers of the Falſeneſs of this Suppoſition, if I ſhould only ſhew (as I hope I ſhall in the following parts of this Diſcourſe) how Men, barely by the Uſe of their Natural Faculties, may attain to all the Knowledge they have, without the help of any Innate Impreſſions; and may arrive at Certainty, without any ſuch Original Notions or Principles. For I imagine any one will eaſily grant, That it would be Impertinent to ſuppoſe, the *Ideas* of Colours Innate in a Creature, to whom God hath given Sight, and a Power to receive them by the Eyes, from External Objects: And no leſs unreaſonable would it be to attribute ſeveral Truths, to the Impreſſions of Nature, and Innate Characters, when we may obſerve in our ſelves Faculties, fit to attain as eaſie and certain Knowledge of them, as if they were Originally imprinted on the Mind.

But becauſe a Man is not permitted without Cenſure to follow his own Thoughts in the ſearch of Truth, when they lead him ever ſo little out of the Common Road: I ſhall ſet down the Reaſons, that made me doubt of the Truth of that Opinion, as an Excuſe for my Miſtake, if I be in one; which I leave to be conſider'd by thoſe, who, with me, diſpoſe themſelves to embrace Truth, where ever they find it.

*General Aſſent the great Argument.*

§. 2. There is nothing more commonly taken for granted, than that there are certain Principles both *Speculative* and *Practical* (for they ſpeak of both) univerſally agreed upon by all Mankind; which therefore they argue, muſt needs be conſtant Impreſſions, which the Souls of Men receive in their firſt Beings, and which they bring into the World with them, as neceſſarily and really as they do any of their inherent Faculties.

§. 3.

*Universal Consent proves nothing Innate.*

§. 3. This Argument, drawn from *Universal Consent*, has this Misfortune in it, that if it were true in matter of Fact, that there were certain Truths, wherein all Mankind agreed, it would not prove them Innate, if there can be any other way shewn, how Men may come to that Universal Agreement, in the things they do consent in; which I presume may be done.

What is, is; *and* it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be, *not universally assented to.*

§. 4. But, which is worse, this Argument of Universal Consent, which is made use of, to prove Innate Principles, seems to me a Demonstration that there are none such; because there are none to which all Mankind give an Universal Assent. I shall begin with the Speculative, and instance in those magnified Principles of Demonstration: *Whatsoever is, is*; and *'Tis impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, which of all others, I think have the most allow'd Title to Innate. These have so settled a Reputation of Maxims universally received, that 'twill, no doubt, be thought strange, if any one should seem to question it. But yet I take liberty to say, that these Propositions are so far from having an Universal Assent, that there are a great Part of Mankind, to whom they are not so much as known.

*Not on the Mind naturally imprinted, because not known to Children, Ideots,* &c.

§. 5. For, first 'tis evident, that all *Children* and *Ideots*, have not the least Apprehension or Thought of them: And the want of that is enough to destroy that Universal Assent, which must needs be the necessary Concomitant of all Innate Truths: It seeming to me near a Contradiction, to say, that there are Truths imprinted on the Soul, which it perceives or understands not: Imprinting, if it signifie any thing, being nothing else, but the making certain Truths to be perceived. For to imprint any thing on the Mind, without the Mind's perceiving it, seems to me hardly Intelligible. If therefore *Children* and *Ideots* have Souls, have Minds, with those Impressions upon them, they must unavoidably perceive them, and necessarily know and assent to these Truths, which since they do not, it is evident that there are no such Impressions. For if they are not Notions naturally imprinted, How can they be Innate? And if they are Notions imprinted, How can they be unknown? To say a Notion is imprinted on the Mind, and yet at the same time to say, that the Mind is ignorant of it, and never yet took notice of it, is to make this Impression nothing. No Proposition can be said to be in the Mind, which it never yet knew, which it was never yet conscious of. For if any one

may; then by the same Reason, all Propositions that are true, and the Mind is capable ever of assenting to, may be said to be in the Mind, and to be imprinted: Since if any one can be said to be in the Mind, which it never yet knew, it must be only because it is capable of knowing it; and so the Mind is of all Truths it ever shall know. Nay, thus Truths may be imprinted on the Mind, which it never did, nor ever shall know: For a Man may live long, and die at last in Ignorance of many Truths, which his Mind was capable of knowing, and that with Certainty. So that if the Capacity of knowing, be the natural Impression contended for, all the Truths a Man ever comes to know, will, by this Account, be every one of them, Innate; and this great Point will amount to no more, but only to a very improper way of speaking; which whilst it pretends to assert the contrary, says nothing different from those, who deny Innate Principles. For no Body, I think, ever denied, that the Mind was capable of knowing several Truths. The Capacity they say, is Innate, the Knowledg acquired. But then to what end such Contest for certain Innate Maxims? If Truths can be imprinted on the Understanding without being perceived, I can see no difference there can be, between any Truths the Mind is capable of knowing, in respect of their Original: They must all be Innate, or all Adventitious: In vain shall a Man go about to distinguish them. He therefore that talks of Innate Notions in the Understanding, cannot (if he intend thereby any distinct sort of Truths) mean such Truths to be in the Understanding, as it never perceived, and is yet wholly ignorant of. For if these Words (*to be in the Understanding*) have any Propriety, they signify to be understood. So that, to be in the Understanding, and, not to be understood; to be in the Mind, and, never to be perceived, is all one, as to say, any thing is, and is not, in the Mind or Understanding. If therefore these two Propositions, *Whatsoever is, is*; and, *It is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, are by Nature imprinted, Children cannot be ignorant of them; Infants, and all that have Souls, must necessarily have them in their Understandings, know the Truth of them, and Assent to it.

§. 6. To avoid this, 'tis usually answered, That all Men know and *assent* to them, *when they come to the use of Reason*, and this is enough to prove them Innate. I answer,

*That Men know them when they come to the use of Reason, answered.*

§. 7. Doubtful Expressions, that have scarce any signification, go for clear Reasons, to those, who being pre-possessed, take not the pains to exa-

mine

mine even what they themselves say. For to apply this Answer with any tolerable Sense to our present Purpose, it must signify one of these two things; either, That as soon as Men come to the use of Reason, these supposed native Inscriptions come to be known, and observed by them: Or else, That the Use and Exercise of Men's Reasons assists them in the Discovery of these Principles, and certainly makes them known to them.

*If Reason discovered them, that would not prove them Innate.*

§. 8. If they mean that by the *Use of Reason* Men may discover these Principles; and that this is sufficient to prove them Innate; their way of arguing will stand thus, (*viz.*) That whatever Truths Reason can certainly discover to us, and make us firmly assent to, those are all naturally imprinted on the Mind; since that universal Assent, which is made the Mark of them, amounts to no more but this; That by the use of Reason, we are capable to come to a certain Knowledge of, and Assent to them; and by this Means there will be no difference between the Maxims of the Mathematicians, and Theorems they deduce from them: All must be equally allow'd Innate, they being all Discoveries made by the use of Reason, and Truths that a rational Creature may certainly come to know, if he apply his Thoughts rightly that Way.

*'Tis false that Reason discovers them.*

§. 9. But how can these Men think the *Use of Reason* necessary to discover Principles that are supposed Innate, when Reason (if we may believe them) is nothing else, but the Faculty of deducing unknown Truths from Principles or Propositions, that are already known? That certainly can never be thought Innate, which we have need of Reason to discover, unless as I have said, we will have all the certain Truths, that Reason ever teaches us, to be Innate. We may as well think the use of Reason necessary to make our Eyes discover visible Objects, as that there should be need of Reason, or the Exercise thereof, to make the Understanding see, what is Originaly engraven in it, and cannot be in the Understanding, before it be perceived by it. So that to make Rerson discover those Truths thus imprinted, is to say, that the use of Reason discovers to a Man, what he knew before; and if Men have those Innate, impressed Truths Originally, and before the use of Reason, and yet are always ignorant of them, till they come to the use of Reason, 'tis in effect to say, that Men know, and know them not at the same time.

§. 10. 'Twill here perhaps be said, That Mathematical Demonstrations, and other Truths, that are not Innate, are not assented

assented to, as soon as propos'd, wherein they are distinguish'd from these Maxims, and other Innate Truths. I shall have occasion to speak of Assent upon the first proposing, more particularly by and by. I shall here only, and that very readily, allow, that these Maxims, and Mathematical Demonstrations are in this different; That the one has need of Reason, using of Proofs, to make them out, and to gain our Assent; but the other, as soon as understood, are without any the least reasoning, Embraced and Assented to. But I withal beg leave to observe, that it lays open the Weakness of this Subterfuge, which requires the *Use of Reason* for the Discovery of these general Truths: Since it must be confessed, that in their Discovery, there is no Use made of Reasoning at all. And I think those who give this Answer, will not be forward to affirm, That the Knowledge of this Maxim, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, is a deduction of our Reason. For this would be to destroy that Bounty of Nature, they seem so fond of, whilst they make the Knowledge of those Principles to depend on the labour of our Thoughts. For all Reasoning is Search, and casting about, and requires Pains and Application. And how can it with any tolerable Sense be suppos'd, that what was imprinted by Nature, as the Foundation and Guide of our Reason, should need the Use of Reason to discover it?

§. 11. Those who will take the Pains to reflect with a little attention on the Operations of the Understanding, will find that this ready Assent of the Mind to some Truths, depends not, either on native inscription, or the *Use of Reason*; but on a Faculty of the Mind quite distinct from both of them, as we shall see hereafter. Reason therefore, having nothing to do in procuring our Assent to these Maxims, if by saying, that *Men know and assent to them, when they come to the Use of Reason*, be meant, That the Use of Reason assists us in the Knowledge of these Maxims, it is utterly False; and were it True, would prove them not to be Innate.

*The coming to the use of Reason, not the time we come to know these Maxims.*

§. 12. If by knowing and assenting to them, *when we come to the Use of Reason*, be meant, that this is the time, when they come to be taken notice of by the Mind; and that as soon as Children come to the use of Reason, they come also to know and assent to these Maxims; this also is False, and Frivolous. *First*, It is False. Because it is evident, these Maxims are not in the Mind so early as the use of Reason: And therefore the coming to the use of Reason is falsly

assigned, as the time of their Discovery. How many Instances of the use of Reason, may we observe in Children, long time before they have any Knowledge of this Maxim, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be?* And a great part of Illiterate People, and Savages, pass many Years, even of their Rational Age, without ever thinking on this, and the like general Propositions. I grant Men come not to the Knowledge of these general and more abstract Truths, which are thought Innate, till they come to the use of Reason; and I add, Nor then neither. Which is so, because till after they come to the use of Reason, those general abstract *Ideas* are not framed in the Mind, about which those general Maxims are, which are mistaken for Innate Principles, but are indeed Discoveries made, and Verities introduced, and brought into the Mind by the same Way, and discovered by the same Steps, as several other Propositions, which no Body was ever so Extravagant as to suppose Innate. This I hoppe to make plain in the sequel of this Discourse. I allow therefore a Necessity, that Men should come to the use of Reason, before they get the Knowledge of those general Truths; but deny, that Men's coming to the use of Reason is the time of their Discovery.

*By this, they are not distinguished from other knowable Truths.*

§. 13. In the mean time, it is observable, that this saying, that Men know, and assent to these Maxims, *when they come to the use of Reason*, amonts in reality of Fact, to no more but this, That they are never known, nor taken notice of, before the use of Reason, but may possibly be assented to sometime after, during a Man's Life; but when, is uncertain: And so may all other knowable Truths, as well as these which therefore have no Advantage, nor Distinction from others, by this Note of being known when we come to the use of Reason; nor are thereby proved to be Innate, but quite the contrary.

*If coming to the use of Reason where the time of their discovery, it would not prove them Innate.*

§. 14. But *Secondly*, Were it true, that the precise time of their being known, and assented to, were, when Men come to the *Use of Reason*; neither would that prove them Innate. This way of arguing is so frivolous, as the Supposition of it self is false. For by what kind of Logick will it appear, that any Notion is Originally by Nature imprinted in the Mind in its first Constitution, because it comes first to be observed, and assented to, when a Faculty of the Mind, which has quite a distinct Province, begins to exert it self? And therefore, the coming to the use

use of Speech, if it were supposed the time, that these Maxims are first assented to (which it may be with as much Truth, as the time when Men come to the use of Reason) would be as good a Proof that they were Innate, as to say, they are Innate because Men assent to them, when they come to the use of Reason. I agree then with these Men of Innate Principles, that there is no Knowledge of these general and self-evident Maxims in the Mind, till it comes to the Exercise of Reason: But I deny that the coming to the use of Reason, is the precise time when they are first taken notice of; and, if that were the precise time, I deny that it would prove them Innate. All that can with any Truth be meant by this Proposition, That Men *assent to them when they come to the use of Reason*, is no more but this, That the making of general abstract *Ideas*, and the Understanding of general Names, being a Concomitant of the Rational Faculty, and growing up with it, Children commonly get not those general *Ideas*, nor learn the Names that stand for them, till having for a good while exercised their Reason about familiar and more particular *Ideas*, they are by their ordinary Discourse and Actions with others, acknowledged to be capable of rational Conversation. If assenting to these Maxims, when Men come to the use of Reason, can be true in any other Sense, I desire it may be shewn; or at least, how in this, or any other Sense it proves them Innate.

*The steps by which the Mind attains several Truths.*

§. 15. The Senses at first let in particular *Ideas*, and furnish the yet empty Cabinet: And the Mind by degrees growing familiar with some of them, they are lodged in the Memory, and Names got to them. Afterwards the Mind proceeding farther, abstracts them, and by degrees learns the use of general Names. In this manner the Mind comes to be furnish'd with *Ideas* and Language, the Materials about which to exercise its discursive Faculty: And the use of Reason becomes daily more visible, as these Materials, that give it Employment, Increase. But though the having of general *Ideas*, and the use of general Words and Reason usually grow together: Yet, I see not, how this any way proves them Innate. The Knowledge of some Truths, I confess, is very early in the Mind; but in a way that shews them not to be Innate. For, if we will observe, we shall find it still to be about *Ideas*, not Innate, but acquired: It being about those first, which are imprinted by external Things, with which Infants have earliest to do, which make the most frequent Impressions on their Senses. In *Ideas*

thus got, the Mind Discovers, That some agree, and others differ, probably as soon as it has any use of Memory; as soon as it is able to retain and receive distinct *Ideas*. But whether it be then, or no, this is certain, it does so long before it has the use of Words; or comes to that, which we commonly call the *Use of Reason*. For a Child knows as certainly, before it can speak, the difference between the *Ideas* of Sweet and Bitter (*i. e.* That Sweet is not Bitter) as it knows afterwards (when it comes to speak) That Wormwood and Sugar-plumbs, are not the same thing.

§. 16. A Child knows not that Three and Four are equal to Seven, till he comes to be able to count to Seven, and has got the Name and *Idea* of Equality: And then upon explaining those Words, he presently assents to, or rather perceives the Truth of that Proposition. But neither does he then readily assent, because it is an Innate Truth, nor was his Assent wanting till then, because he wanted the *Use of Reason*; but the Truth of it appears to him, as soon as he has settled in his Mind the clear and distinct *Ideas*, that these Names stand for: And then he knows the Truth of that Proposition, upon the same Grounds, and by the same means, that he knew before, That a Rod and Cherry, are not the same thing; and upon the same Grounds also, that he may come to know afterwards, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, as shall be more fully shewn hereafter. So that the later it is before any one comes to have those general *Ideas*, about which those Maxims are; or to know the Signification of those general Terms, that stand for them; or to put together in his Mind, the *Ideas* they stand for; the later also will it be, before he comes to assent to those Maxims, whose Terms, with the *Ideas* they stand for, being no more Innate, than those of a Cat or a Weesel, he must stay till Time and Observation have acquainted him with them; and then he will be in a Capacity to know the Truth of these Maxims, upon the first Occasion, that shall make him put together those *Ideas* in his Mind, and observe, whether they agree or disagree, according as is expressed in those Propositions. And therefore it is, That a Man knows that Eighteen and Nineteen, are equal to Thirty Seven, by the same self Evidence, that he knows One and Two to be equal to Three: Yet, a Child knows this, not so soon as the other; not for want of the use of Reason; but because the *Ideas* the Words Eighteen, Nineteen, and Thirty Seven stand for, are not so soon got, as those, which are signify'd by One, Two, and Three.

§. 17.

§. 17. This Evasion therefore of general Assent, when Men come to the use of Reason, failing as it does, and leaving no difference between those supposed-Innate, and other Truths, that are afterwards acquired and learnt, Men have endeavoured to secure an Universal Assent to those they call Maxims, by saying, they are generally *assented to, as soon as proposed*, and the Terms they are propos'd in, understood: Seeing all Men, even Children, as soon as they hear and understand the Terms, assent to these Propositions, they think it is sufficient to prove them Innate. For since Men never fail, after they have once understood the Words, to acknowledge them for undoubted Truths, they would infer, That certainly these Propositions were first lodged in the Understanding, which, without any teaching, the Mind at very first Proposal, immediately closes with, and assents to, and after that never doubts again.

*Assenting as soon as proposed and understood, proves them not Innate.*

§. 18. In Answer to this, I demand whether ready *Assent*, given to a Proposition *upon first hearing*, and understanding the Terms, be a certain mark of an Innate Principle? If it be not, such a general Assent is in vain urged as a Proof of them: If it be said, that it is a mark of Innate, they must then allow all such Propositions to be Innate, which are generally assented to, as soon as heard, whereby they will find themselves plentifully stored with Innate Principles. For upon the same ground (*viz.*) of Assent at first hearing and understanding the Terms, That Men would have those Maxims pass for Innate, they must also admit several Propositions about Numbers, to be Innate: And thus, *That One and Two, are equal to Three, That Two and Two, are equal to Four*; and a multitude of other the like Propositions in Numbers, that every Body assents to, at first hearing, and understanding the Terms, must have a place amongst these Innate Axioms. Nor is this the Prerogative of Numbers alone, and Propositions made about several of them: But even natural Philosophy, and all the other Sciences afford Propositions, which are sure to meet with Assent, as soon as they are understood. *That Two Bodies cannot be in the same place*, is a Truth, that no Body any more sticks at, than at this Maxim, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*; *That White is not Black*; *That a Square is not a Circle*; *That Yellowness is not Sweetness*: These, and a Million of other such

*If such an Assent be a mark of Innate, then that One and Two are equal to Three; that Sweetness is not Bitterness; and a Thousand the like, must be Innate.*

Propositions, as many at least, as we have distinct *Ideas*, every Man in his Wits, at first hering, and knowing what the Names stand for, must necessarily assent to. If these Men will be true to their own Rule, and have *Assent at first hearing and understanding the Terms*, to be a Mark of Innate, they must allow, not only as many Innate Propositions, as Men have distinct *Ideas*; but as many as Men can make Propositions wherein different *Ideas* are denied one of another. Since every Proposition, wherein one different *Idea* is denied of another, will as certainly find Assent at first hearing and understanding the Terms, as this general one, *It is impossible for the same to be, and not to be*; or that which is the Foundation of it, and is the easier understood of the two, *The same is not different*: By which Account, they will have Legions of Innate Propositions of this one sort, without mentioning any other. But since no Proposition can be Innate, unless the *Ideas*, about which it is, be Innate, This will be, to suppose all our *Ideas* of Colours, Sounds, Tastes, Figure, *&c.* Innate; than which, there cannot be any thing more opposite to Reason and Experience. Universal and ready Assent upon hering and understanding the Terms, is (I grant) a mark of Self-evidence: But Self-evidence, depending not on Innate Impressions, but on something else (as we shall shew hereafter) belongs to several Propositions, which no Body was yet so extravagant, as to pretend to be Innate.

*Such less general Propositions known before these universal Maxims.*

§. 19 Nor let it be said, That those more particular Self-evident Propositions, which are assented to at first hearing, as, *That One, and Two are equal to Three: That Green is not Red*, &c. are received as the Consequences of those more universal Propositions, which are look'd on as Innate Principles; since any one, who will but take the Pains to observe what passes in the Understanding, will certainly find, That these, and the like less general Propositions, are certainly known and firmly assented to, by those, who are utterly Ignorant of those more general Maxims; and so, being earlier in the Mind than those (as they are called) first Principles, cannot owe to them the Assent, wherewith they are received at first hearing.

*One and One, equal to Two, &c. not general nor useful, answered.*

§. 20. If it be said, that these Propositions, *viz. Two and Two are equal to Four*; *Red is not Blue*, &c. are not general Maxims, nor of any great use. I answer, That makes nothing to the Argument of universal assent, upon hearing and understanding. For, If that be the certain mark of Innate, whatever

ever Proposition can be found, that receives general Assent, as soon as heard and understood, that must be admitted for an Innate Proposition, as well as this Maxim, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, they being upon this Ground equal. And as to the difference of being more general, that makes this Maxim more remote from being Innate; those general and abstract *Ideas*, being more strangers to our first Apprehensions, than those of more particular Self-evident Propositions; and therefore, 'tis longer before they are admitted and assented to by the growing Understanding. And as to the usefulness of these magnified Maxims, that perhaps will not be found so great as is generally conceived, when it comes to its due place to be more fully considered.

*These Maxims not being known sometimes till proposed, proves them not Innate.*

§. 21. But we have not yet done with *Assenting to Propositions at first hearing and understanding their Terms*; 'tis fit we first take notice, That this, instead of being a mark, that they are Innate, is a proof of the contrary: Since it supposes, that several, who understand and know other things, are ignorant of these Principles, till they are propos'd to them; and that one may be unacquainted with these Truths, till he hears them from others. For if they were Innate, what need they be propos'd, in order to gaining Assent; when, by being in the Understanding, by a natural and original Impression (if there were any such) they could not but be known before? Or doth the proposing them, print them clearer in the Mind, than Nature did? If so, then the Consequence will be, That a Man knows them better, after he has been thus taught them, than he did before. Whence it will follow, That these Principles may be made more evident to us by others teaching, than Nature has made them by Impression; which will ill agree with the Opinion of Innate Principles, and give but little Authority to them; but on the contrary, makes them unfit to be the Foundations of all our other Knowledge, as they are pretended to be. This cannot be deny'd, that Men grow first acquainted with many of these Self evident Truths, upon their being proposed: But it is clear, that whosoever does so, finds in himself, That he then begins to know a Proposition, which he knew not before; and which from thenceforth he never questions; not because it was Innate; but because the consideration of the Nature of the things contained in those Words, would not suffer him to think otherwise, how, or whensoever he is brought to reflect on them. And if whatever is

assented to at first hearing, and understanding the Terms, must pass for an Innate Principle, every well grounded Observation drawn from particulars into a general Rule, must be Innate. When yet it is certain, that not all, but only sagacious Heads light at first on these Observations, and reduce them into general Propositions, nor Innate, but collected from a preceding acquaintance, and reflection on particular Instances. These, when observing Men have made them, unobserving Men, when they are propos'd to them, cannot refuse their Assent to.

*Implicitly known before proposing, signifies that the Mind is capable of understanding them, or else signifies nothing.*

§. 22. If it be said, The Understanding hath an *implicit Knowledge* of these Principles, but not an explicit, before this first hearing, (as they must, who will say, That they are in the Understanding before they are known) it will be hard to conceive what is meant by a Principle imprinted on the Understanding Implicitly; unless it be this, That the Mind is capable of underdansting and assenting firmly to such Propositions. And thus all Mathematical Demonstrations, as well as first Principles, must be received as native Impressions on the Mind: Which I fear they will scarce allow them to be, who find it harder to demonstrate a Proposition, than assent to it, when demonstrated. And few Mathematicians, will be forward to believe, That all the Diagrams they have drawn, were but Copies of those Innate Characters, which Nature had ingraven upon their Minds.

*The Argument of Assenting on first hearing, is upon a false supposition of no precedent teaching.*

§. 23. There is, I fear, this farther weakness in the foregoing Argument, which would perswade us, That therefore those Maxims are to be thought Innate, which Men *admit at first hearing*, because they assent to Propositions, which they are not tought nor do receive from the force of any Argument or Demonstration, but a bare Explication or Understanding of the Terms. Under which, there seems to me to lie this fallacy; That Men are supposed not to be *taught*, nor to *learn* any thing *de novo*; when in truth, they are taught, and do learn something they were ignorant of before. For first it is evident, they have learned the Terms and their Signification; neither of which was Born with them. But this is not all the acquired Knowledge in the Case: The *Ideas* themselves, about which the Proposition is, are not Born with them, no more than their Names, but goe afterwards. So that in all Propositions that are assented to, at first hearing; the

Terms

Terms of the Proposition, their standing for such *Ideas*, and the *Ideas* themselves that they stand for, being neither of them Innate, I would fain know what there is remaining in such Propositions, that is Innate. For I would gladly have any one name that Proposition, whose Terms or *Ideas* were either of them Innate. We by degrees get *Ideas* and Names, and learn their appropriated Connexion one with another; and then to Propositions, made in such Terms, whose Signification we have learnt, and wherein the Agreement or Disagreement we can perceive in our *Ideas*, when put together, is expressed, we at first hearing assent; though to other Propositions, in themselves as certain and evident, but which are concerning *Ideas*, not so soon or so easily got, we are at the same time no way capable of assenting. For though a Child quickly assent to this Proposition, *That an Apple is not Fire*; when, by familiar Acquaintance, he has got the *Ideas* of those two different things distingly imprinted on his Mind, and has learnt that the Names *Apple* and *Fire* stand for them; yet it will be some Years after, perhaps, before the same Child will assent to this Proposition, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be.* Because, that though, perhaps, the Words are as easy to be learnt; yet the Signification of them, being more large, comprehensive, and abstract, than of the Names annexed to those sensible things, the Child hath to do with; it is longer before he learns their precise meaning, and it requires more time plainly to form in his Mind those general *Ideas*, they stand for. Till that be done, you will in vain endeavour to make any Child assent to a Proposition, made up of such general Terms: But as soon as ever he has got those *Ideas*, and learn'd their Names, he forwardly closes with the one, as well as the other of the forementioned Propositions; and with both for the same Reason; (*viz.*) because he finds the *Ideas* he has in his Mind, to agree or disagree, according as the Words standind for them, are affirmed, or denied one of another in the Proposition. But if Propositions be brought to him in Words, which stand for *Ideas* he has not yet in his Mind; to such Propositions, however evidently true or false in themselves, he affords neither assent nor dissent, but is ignorant. For Words being but empty Sounds, any farther than they are signs of our *Ideas*, we cannot but assent to them, as they correspond to those *Ideas* we have, but no farther than that. But the shewing by what Steps and Ways Kowledge comes into our Minds, and grounds of several degrees of assent, being the Business of the following Discourse, it may suffice to have only touched on it here,

here, as one Reason, that made me doubt of those Innate Principles.

*Not Innate, because not universally assented to.*

§. 24. To conclude this Argument of *Universal Consent*, I agree with these Defenders of Innate Principles. That if they are *Innate*, they must needs *have Universal Assent*. For that a Truth should be Innate, and yet not assented to, is to me as unintelligible, as for a Man to know a Truth, and be ignorant of it at the same time. But then, by these Men's own Confession, they cannot be Innate; since they are not assented to, by those who understand not the Terms, nor by a great part of those who do understand them, but have yet never heard, nor thought of those Propositions; which I think, is at least one half of Mankind. But were the Number far less, it would be enough to destroy *universal assent*, and thereby shew these Propositions not to be Innate, if Children alone were ignorant of them.

*These Maxims not the first known.*

§. 25. But that I may not be accused, to argue from the thoughts of Infants, which are unknown to us, and to conclude, from what passes in their Understandings, before they express it; I say next, That these two general Propositions are not the Truths, that *first possess the Minds* of Children; nor are antecedent to all acquired, and adventitious Notions: which if they were Innate, they must needs be. Whether we can determine *is* or no, it matters not, there is certainly a time, when Children begin to think, and their Words and Actions do assure us, that they do so. When therefore they are capable of Thought, of Knowledge, of Assent, can it rationally be supposed, they can be ignorant of those Notions that Nature has imprinted, were there any such? Can it be imagin'd, with any appearance of Reason, That they perceive the Impressions from things without; and be at the same time ignorant of those Characters, which Nature, it self has taken care to stamp within? Can they receive and assent to adventitious Notions, and be ignorant of those, which are supposed woven into the very Principles of their Being, and imprinted there in indelible Characters, to be the Foundation and Guide of all their acquired Knowledge, and future Reasonings? This would be, to make Nature take Pains to no Purpose; or, at least, to write very ill; since its Characters could not be read by those Eyes, which saw other things very well; and those are very ill supposed the clearest parts of Truth, and the Foundations of all our Knowledge, which are

not first known, and without which, the undoubted Knowledge of several other Things may be had. The Child certainly knows, that the *Nurse* that feeds it, is neither the *Cat* it plays with, nor the *Blackmoor* it is afraid of; That the *Wormseed* or *Mustard* it refuses, is not the *Apple* or *Sugar* it cries for; this it is certainly and undoubtedly assured of: But will any one say, it is by Virtue of this Principle, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, that it so firmly assents to these, and other parts of its Knowledge? Or that the Child has any Notion or Apprehension of that Proposition at an Age, wherein yet 'tis plain? it knows a great many other Truths? He that will say, Children join these general abstract Speculations with their Sucking-Botles, and their Ratles, may, perhaps, with Justice be thought to have more Passion and Zeal for his Opinion; but less Sincerity and Truth, than one of that Age.

*And so not Innate.*

§. 26. Though therefore there be several general Propositions, that meet with constant and ready assent, as soon as proposed to Men grown up, who have attained the use of more general and abstract *Ideas*, and Names standing for them; yet they not being to be found in those of tender Years, who nevertheless know other things, they cannot pretend to universal assent of intelligent Persons, and so by no means can be supposed Innate: It being impossible, that any Truth which is Innate (if there were any such) should be unknown, at least to any one, who knows any thing else. Since, if they are Innate Truths, they must be Innate Thoughts; there being nothing a Truth in the Mind, that it has never thought on. Whereby it is evident, if there be any *Innate Truths*, they *must necessarily be the first of any thought on*; the first that appear there.

*Not Innate, because they appear least, where what is Innate shews it self clearest.*

§. 27. That the general Maxims, we are discoursing of, are not known to *Children*, *Ideots*, and a great part of *Mankind*, we have already sufficiently proved; whereby it is evident, they have not an universal Assent, nor are general Impressions. But there is this farther Argument in it, against their being Innate: That these Characters, if they were native and original Impressions, *should appear fairest and clearest in* those Persons, in whom yet we find no Foot-steps of them: And, 'tis, in my Opinion, a strong Presumption, that they are not Innate; since they are least known to those, in whom, if they were Innate, they must needs exert themselves with most Force and Vigour. For *Children*, *Ideots*, *Savages*, and *Illiterate*

*Illiterate* People, being of all others the least corrupted by Custom, or borrowed Opinions; Learning, and Education, having not cast their Native Thoughts into new Moulds; nor by superinducing foreign and studied Doctrines confounded those fair Characters Nature had written there; one might reasonably imagine, that in their Minds these Innate Notions should lie open fairly to every one's view, as 'tis certain the Thoughts of Children do. It might very well be expected, that these Principles should be perfectly known to Naturals; which being stamped immediately on the Soul (as these Men suppose) can have no dependence on the Constitutions, or Organs of the Body, the only confessed difference between them and others. One would think, according to these Men's Principles, That all these Native Beams of Light (were there any such) should in those, who have no Reserves, no Arts of Concealment, shine out in their full Lustre, and leave us in no more doubt of their being there, than we are of their love of Pleasure, and abhorrence of Pain. But alas, amongst *Children*, *Ideots*, *Savages*, and the grossly *Illiterate*, what general Maxims are to be found? What universal Principles of Knowledge? Their Notions are few and narrow, borrowed only from those Objects, they have had most to do with, and which have made upon their Senses the frequentest and strongest Impressions. A Child knows his Nurse and his Cradle, and by degrees the Play-things of a little more advanced Age: And a young Savage has, perhaps, his Head fill'd with Love and Hunting, according to the fashion of his Tribe. But he that from a Child untaught, or a wild Inhabitants of the Woods, will expect these abstract Maxims and reputed Principles of Sciences, will I fear, find himself mistaken. Such kind of general Propositions, are seldom mentioned in the Huts of *Indians*; much less are they to be found in the Thoughts of *Children*, or any Impressions of them on the Minds of *Naturals*. They are the Language and Business of the Schools, and Academies of learned Nations, accustomed to that sort of Conversation, or Learning, where Disputes are frequent: These Maxims being suited to artificial Argumentation, and useful for Conviction; but not much conducing to the discovery of Truth, or advancement of Knowledge. But of these small use for the improvement of Knowledge, I shall have occasion to speak more at large, *l.* 4. *c.* 7.

*Recapitulation.*

§. 28. I know not how absurd this may seem to the Masters of Demonstration: And probably, it will hardly down with any Body at first Hearing. I must therefore beg a little truce with Prejudice,

judice, and the forbearance of Censure, till I have been heard out in the Sequel of this Discourse, being very willing to submit to better Judgments. And since I impartially search after Truth, I shall not be sorry to be convinced that I have been too fond of my own Notions; which I confess we are all apt to be, when Application and Study have warmed our Heads with them.

Upon the whole matter, I cannot see any ground, to think these two famed speculative Maxims Innate; since they are not universally assented to; and the assent they so generally find, is no other, than what several Propositions, not allowed to be Innate, equally partake in with them: And since the Assent that is given them, is produced another way, and comes not from natural Inscription, as I doubt not but to make appear in the following Discourse. And if *these first Principles* of Knowledge and Science, *are* found *not* to be *Innate*, *no other speculative Maxims can* (I suppose) *with better Right pretend to be so.*

## CHAP. III.

### *No Innate Practical Principles.*

*No moral Principles so clear and so generally received, as the forementioned speculative Maxims.*

§. 1. IF those speculative Maxims, whereof we discoursed in the foregoing Chapter, have not an actual universal Assent from all Mankind, as we there proved, it is much more visible concerning *Practical Principles*, that they *come short of an universal Reception*: And I think it will be hard to instance any one moral Rule, which can pretend to so general and ready an assent as, *What is, is*, or to be so manifest a Truth as this, *That it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be.* Whereby it is evident, that they are farther removed from a title to be Innate; and the doubt of their being native Impressions on the Mind, is stronger against these moral Principles than the other. Not that it brings their Truth at all in question. They are equally true, though not equally evident. Those speculative Maxims carry their own Evidence with them: But moral Principles require Reasoning and Discourse, and some Exercise of the Mind, to Discover the certainty of their Truth. They lie not open as natural Characters ingraven on the Mind; which, if any such were,

were, they must needs be visible by themselves, and by their own light be certain and known to every Body. But this is no Derogation to their Truth and Certainty, no more than it is to the Truth or Certainty of the Three Angles of a Triangle being equal to right ones, because it is not so evident, as *The whole is bigger than a part*; nor so apt to be assented to at first hearing. It may suffice, that these moral Rules are capable of Demonstration: And therefore it is our own faults, if we come not to a certain Knowledge of them. But the Ignorance wherein many Men are of them, and the slowness of Assent, wherewith others receive them, are manifest Proofs, that they are not Innate, and such as offer themselves to their view without searching.

*Faith and Justice not owned as Principles by all Men.*

§. 2. Whether there be any such moral Principles, wherein all Men do agree, I appeal to any, who have been but moderately conversant in the History of Mankind, and look'd abroad beyond the Smoak of their own Chimneys. Where is that practical Truth, that is universally received without doubt or question, as it must be if Innate? *Justice*, and keeping of Contracts, is that which *most Men seem to agree in.* This is a Principle, which is thought to extend it self to the Dens of Thieves, and the Confederacies of the greatest Villains; and they who have gone farthest towards the putting off of Humanity it self, keep Faith and Rules of Justice one with another. I grant that Outlaws themselves do this one amongst another; but 'tis without receiving these as the Innate Laws of Nature. They practise them as Rules of Convenience within their own Communities: But it is impossible to conceive, that he imbraces Justice as a Practical Principle, who acts fairly with his Fellow High-way-men, and at the same time Plunders or Kills the next Honest Man he meets with. Justice and Truth are the common Ties of Society; and therefore, even Outlaws, and Robbers, who break with all the World besides, must keep Faith and Rules of Equity amongst themselves, or else they cannot hold together. But will any one say, That those that live by Fraud and Rapine, have Innate Principles of Truth and Justice which they allow and assent to?

Object. *Though Men deny them in their Practice, yet they admit them in their Thoughts, answered.*

§. 3. Perhaps it will be urged, That the *tacit assent of their Minds agrees to what their Practice contradicts.* I answer, *First*, I have always thought the Actions of Men the best Interpreters of their

Thoughts,

Thoughts. But since it is certain, that most Men's Practice, and some Men's open Professions have either questioned or denied these Principles, it is impossible to establish an universal consent (though we should look for it only amongst grown Men) without which, it is impossible to conclude them Innate. *Secondly*, 'T is very strange and unreasonable, to suppose Innate Practical Principles, that terminate only in Contemplation. Practical Principles derived from Nature, are there for Operation, and must produce Conformity of Action, not barely speculative Assent to their Truth, or else they are in vain distinguish'd from speculative Maxims. Nature, I confess, has put into Man a desire of Happiness, and an aversion to Misery: These indeed are Innate Practical Principles, (which as practical Principles ought) do continue constantly to operate and influence all our Actions, without ceasing: These may be observ'd in all Persons and all Ages, steady and universal; but these are Inclinations of the Appetite to good, not Impressions of truth on the Understanding. I deny not, that there are natural Tendencies imprinted on the Minds of Men; and that, from the very first Instances of Sense and Perception, there are some things, that are grateful, and others unwelcome to them; some things that they incline to, and others that they fly: But this makes nothing for Innate Characters on the Mind, which are to be the Principles of Knowledge, regulating our Practice. Such natural Impressions on the Understanding, are so far from being confirm'd hereby, that this is an Argument against them; since if there were certain Characters, imprinted by Nature on the Understandings, as the Principles of Knowledge, we could not but perceive them constantly operate in us, and influence our Knowledge, as we do those others on the Will and Appetite; which never cease to be the constant Springs and Motives of all our Actions, to which, we perpetually feel them strongly impelling us.

§. 4. Another Reason that makes me doubt of any Innate Practical Principles, is, That I think, *there cannot any one moral Rule be propos'd, whereof a Man may not justly demand a Reason:* Which would be perfectly ridiculous and absurd, if they were Innate, or so much as self-evident; which every Innate Principle must needs be, and not need any Proof to ascertain its Truth, nor want any Reason to gain it Approbation. He would be thought void of common Sense, who asked on the one side, or on the other side, when to give a Reason, *Why it is impossible for*

*Moral Rules need a Proof, ergo not Innate.*

*the*

*the same thing to be, and not to be.* It carries its own Light and Evidence with it, and needs no other Proof: He that understands the Terms, assent to it for its own sake, or else nothing will ever be able to prevail with him to do it. But should that most unshaken Rule of Morality, and Foundation of all Social Virtue, *That one should do as he would be done unto*, be propos'd to one, who never heard it before, but yet is of Capacity to understand its Meaning; Might he not without any absurdity ask a Reason why? And were not he that propos'd it, bound to make out the Truth and Reasonableness of it to him? Which plainly shews it not to be Innate; for if it were, it could neither want nor receive any Proof; but must needs (at least, as soon as heard and understood) be received and assented to, as an unquestionable Truth, which a Man can by no means doubt of. So that the Truth of all these moral Rules, plainly depends upon some other antecedent to them, and from which they must be deduced, which could not be, if either they were Innate, or so much as self-evident.

*Instance in keeping Compacts.*

§. 5. That Men should keep their Compacts, is certainly a great and undeniable Rule in Morality: But yet, if a Christian, who has the view of Happiness and Misery in another Life, be asked why a Man must keep his Word, he will *give* this as a *Reason*: Because God, who as the Power of eternal Life and Death, requires it of us. But if an *Hobbist* be asked why; he will answer, Because the Publick requires it, and the *Leviathan* will punish you, if you do not. And if one of the old *Heathen* Philosophers had been asked, he would have answer'd: Because it was dishonest, below the Dignity of a Man, and opposite to Vertue, the highest Perfection of Humane Nature, to do otherwise.

*Vertue generally approved not because Innate, but because profitable.*

§. 6. Hence naturally flows the great variety of Opinions, concerning Moral Rules, which are to be found among Men, according to the different sorts of Happiness, they have a Prospect of, or propose to themselves: Which could not be, if Practical Principles were Innate, and imprinted in our Minds immediately by the Hand of God. I grant the Existence of God, is so many ways manifest, and the Obedience we owe him, so congruous to the Light of Reason, that a great part of Mankind give Testimony to the Law of Nature: But yet I think it must be allowed, that several Moral Rules, may receive from Mankind, a very general Approbation,

probation, without either knowing, or admitting the true ground of Morality; which can only be the Will and Law of a God, who sees Men in the Dark, has in his Hand Rewards and Punishments, and Power enough to call to account the Proudest Offender. For God, having, by an inseparable Connexion, joined *Virtue* and *Publick Happiness* together; and made the Practice thereof, necessary to the preservation of Society, and visibly *beneficial* to all, with whom the Virtuous Man has to do; it is no wonder, that every one should, not only allow, but recommend, and magnifie those Rules to others, from whose observance of them, he is sure to reap Advantage to himself. He may, out of Interest, as well as Conviction, cry up that for Sacred; which if once trampled on, and prophaned, he himself cannot be safe nor secure. This, though it takes nothing from the Moral and Eternal Obligation, which these Rules evidently have; yet it shews that the outward acknowledgment Men pay to them in their Words, proves not that they are Innate Principles: Nay, it proves not so much, as, that Men assent to them inwardly in their own Minds, as the inviolable Rules of their own Practice: Since we find that Self-interest and the Conveniences of this Life, make many Men, own an outward Profession and Approbation of them, whose Actions sufficiently prove, that they very little consider the Law-giver, that prescribed these Rules; nor the Hell he has ordain'd for the Punishment of those that transgress them.

*Men's Actions convince us, that the Rule of Vertue is not their internal Principle.*

§. 7. For, if we will not in Civility allow too much Sincerity to the Professions of most *Men*, but think their Actions to be the Interpreters of their Thoughts, we shall find, that they have *no* such internal Veneration for these Rules, nor so *full a Persuasion of their Certainty* and Obligation. The great Principle of Morality, *To do as one would be done to*, is more commended, than practised. But the Breach of this Rule cannot be a greater Vice, than to teach others, That it is no Moral Rule, nor Obligatory, would be thought Madness, and contrary to that Interest Men sacrifice to, when they break it themselves. Perhaps *Conscience* will be urged as checking us for such Breaches, and so the internal Obligation and Establishment of the Rule be preserved.

*Conscience no proof of any Innate Moral Rule.*

§. 8. To which I answer, That I doubt not, but without being written on their Hearts, many Men may, by the same way that they come to the Knowledge of other things, come to assent to several

veral Moral Rules, and be convinced of their Obligation. Others also may come to be of the same Mind, from their Education, Company, and Customs of their Country; which *Persuasion, however got, will serve to set Conscience on work*, which is nothing else, but our own Opinion or Judgment of the Moral Rectitude or Pravity of our own Actions. And if Conscience be a Proof of Innate Principles, Contraries may be Innate Principles: Since some Men, with the same Bent of Conscience, prosecute what others avoid.

*Instances of Enormities practised without remorse.*

§. 9. But I cannot see how any *Men*, should ever *transgress* those *Moral Rules*, *with Confidence*, and *Serenity*, were they Innate, and stamped upon their Minds. View but an Army at the sacking of a Town, and see what Observation, or Sense of Moral Principles, or what touch of Conscience, for all the Out-rages they do. *Robberies*, *Murders*, *Rapes*, are the Sports of Men set at liberty from Punishment and Censure. Have there not been whole Nations, and those of the most Civilized People, amongst whom, the exposing their Children, and leaving them in the Fields, to Perish by Want or Wild Beasts, has been the Practice, as little condemned or scrupled, as the begetting them? Do they not still, in some Countries, put them into the same Graves with their Mothers, if they die in Child-birth; Or dispatch them, if a pretended Astrologer declares them to have unhappy Stars? And are there not Places, where at a certain Age, they kill, or expose their Parents without any remorse at all? In a part of *Asia*, the sick, when their Case comes to be thought desperate, are carried out and laid on the Earth, before they are dead; and left there, exposed to Wind and Weather, to Perish without Assistance or Pity. (*a*) It is familiar among the *Mengrelians*, a People professing Christianity, to Bury their Children alive without scruple. (*b*) There are Places where they Eat their own Children. (*c*) The *Caribes* were wont to Geld their Children, on purpose to Fat and Eat them. (*d*) And *Garcilasso de la Vega* tells us of a People in *Peru*, which were wont to Fat and Eat the Children they got on their female Captives, whom they kept as Concubines for that purpose; and when they were past Breeding, the Mothers themselves were Kill'd too and Eaten. (*e*) The Vertues, whereby the *Tououpinambos* believed they merited Paradise, were Revenge,

(a) *Gruber* apud *Thevenot*, *part* 4. *p.* 13.
(b) *Lambert* apud *Thevenot*, *p.* 38.
(c) *Vossius* de Nili Origine *c.* 18. 19.
(d) *P. Mart. Dec.* 1.
(e) Hist. des Incas, *l.* 1. *c.* 12.

Revenge, and eating abundance of their Enemies. They have not so much as the Name for God, (*f*) No acknowledgment of any God, no Religion, no Worship, *page* 231. The Saints, who are canonized amongst the *Turks*, lead Lives, which one cannot with Modesty relate. A remarkable Passage to this purpose, out of the Voyage of *Baumgarten*, which is a Book, not every Day to be met with, I shall set down at large, in the Language it is published in. *Ibi* (*sc. prope* Belbes *in* Ægypto) *vidimus sanctum unum Saracenicum inter arenarum cumulos, ita ut ex utero matris prodiit nudum sedentem. Mos est, ut didicimus,* Mahometistis, *ut eos qui amentes & sine ratione sunt, pro sanctis colant & venerentur. Insuper & eos qui cum diu vitam egerint inquinatissimam, voluntariam demum pœnitentiam & paupertatem, sanctitate venerandos deputant. Ejusmodi verò genus hominum libertatem quandam effrænem habent, domos quas volunt intrandi, edendi, bibendi, & quod majus est, concumbendi; ex quo concubitu, si proles secuta fuerit, sancta similiter habetur. His ergo hominibus, dum vivunt, magnos exhibent honores; mortuis verò vel templa vel monumenta extruunt amplissima, eosq; contingere ac sepelire maximæ fortunæ ducunt loco. Audivimus hæc dicta & dicenda per interpretem à Mucrelo nostro. Insuper sanctum illum, quem eo loci vidimus, publicitus apprimè commendari, eum esse Hominem sanctum, divinum ac integritate præcipuum; eo quod, nec fœminarum unquam esset, nec puerorum, sed tantum modo asellarum concubitur atque mularum,* Peregr. Baumgarten, l. 2. c. 1. p. 73. More of the same Kind, concerning these precious Saints amongst the *Turks*, may be seen in *Pietro della Valle*, in his Letter of the 25*th* of *January*, 1616. Where then are those Innate Principles, of Justice, Piety, Gratitude, Equity, Chastity? Or, where is that universal Consent, that assures us there are such inbred Rules? Murders in Duels, when Fashion has made them honourable, are committed without remorse of Conscience: Nay, in many Places, Innocence in this Case is the greatest Ignominy. And if we look abroad, to take a view of Men, as they are, we shall find, that they have remorse in one Place, for doing or omitting that, which others, in another Place, think they merit by.

(*f*) *Lery, c.* 16.

*Men have contrary Practical Principles.*

§. 10. He that will carefully peruse the History of Mankind, and look abroad into the several Tribes of Men, and with Indifferency survey their Actions, will be able to satisfy himself, that there is scarce that Principle of Morality to be named, or *Rule* of *Vertue* to be thought on (those only excepted, that are absolutely necessary to hold Society together, which

commonly too are neglected betwixt distinct Societies) which is not, somewhere or other, *slighted* and condemned by the general Fashion of *whole Societies* of Men, governed by Practical Opinions, and Rules of Living, quite opposite to others.

*Whole Nations reject several Moral Rules.*

§. 11. Here, perhaps, 'twill be objected, that it is no Argument, that the *Rule* is *not known*, *because* it is *broken*. I grant the Objection good, where Men, though they transgress, yet disown not the Law; where fear of Shame, Censure, or Punishment, carries the Mark of some Awe it has upon them. But it is impossible to conceive, that a *whole Nation* of Men should all *publickly reject* and renounce, what every one of them, certainly and infallibly, knew to be a Law: For so they must, who have it naturally imprinted on their Minds. 'Tis possible, Men may sometimes own *Rules of Morality*, which, in their private Thoughts, they do not believe to be true, only to keep themselves in Reputation, and Esteem amongst those, who are persuaded of their Obligation. But 'tis not to be imagin'd, That a whole Society of Men, should publickly and professedly, disown, and cast off a Rule, which they could not, in their own Minds, but be infallibly certain, was a Law; nor be ignorant, that all Men, they should have to do with, knew it to be such: And therefore must every one of them apprehend from others, all the Contempt and Abhorrence due to one, who professes himself void of Humanity; and one, who confounding the known and natural Measures of Right and Wrong, cannot but be look'd on, as the professed Enemy of their Peace and Happiness. Whatever Practical Principles is Innate, cannot but be known to every one, to be just and good. It is therefore little less than a Contradiction, to suppose, That whole Nations of Men should both in their Professions, and Practice, unanimously and universally give the Lye to what, by the most invincible Evidence, every one of them knew to be True, Right, and Good. This is enough to satisfy us, That no Practical Rule, which is any where universally, and with publick Approbation, or Allowance, transgressed, can be supposed Innate. But I have something farther to add, in Answer to this Objection.

§. 12. The breaking of a Rule, say you, is no Argument that it is unknown. I grant it: But the *generally allowed Breach of it any where*, I say, *is a Proof, that it is not Innate.* For Example, Let us take any of these Rules, which being the most obvious Deductions of Humane Reason, and conformable to the natural Inclination of the greatest part of Men, fewest People have had the

the Impudence to deny, or Inconsideration to doubt of. If any can be thought to be naturally imprinted, none, I think, can have a fairer Pretence to be Innate, than this; *Parents, preserve and cherish your Children.* When therefore you say, That this is an Innate Rule, What do you mean? Either, that is an Innate Principle, which upon all Occasions, excites and directs the Actions of all Men: Or else, that it is a Truth, which all Men have imprinted on their Minds, and which therefore they Know, and Assent to. But in neither of these Senses is it Innate. *First*, That it is not a Principle, which influences all Men's Actions, is, what I have proved by the Examples before cited: Nor need we seek so far as *Mingrelia* or *Peru*, to find Instances of such as neglect, abuse, nay and destroy their Children; or look on it only as the more than Brutality of some Savage and Barbarous Nations, when we remember, that it was a familiar and uncondemned Practice amongst the *Greeks* and *Romans*, to expose without pity or remorse, their Innocent Infants. *Secondly*, That it is an Innate Truth, known to all Men, is also False. For, *Parents, preserve your Children*, is so far from an Innate Truth, that it is no Truth at all; it being a Command, and not a Proposition, and so not capable of Truth or Falshood. To make it capable of being Assented to as true, it must be reduced to some such Proposition as this: *It is the Duty of Parents to preserve their Children.* But what Duty is, cannot be understood without a Law; nor a Law be known, or supposed without a Law-maker, or without Reward and Punishment: So that it is impossible, that this, or any other Practical Principle should be Innate; *i. e.* be imprinted on the Mind as a Duty, without supposing the *Ideas* of God, of Law, of Obligation, of Punishment, of a Life after this, Innate. For that Punishment follows not, in this Life, the breach of this Rule; and consequently, that it has not the Force of a Law in Countries, where the generally allow'd Practice runs counter to it, is in it self evident. But these *Ideas* (which must be all of them Innate, if any thing as a Duty be so) are so far from being Innate, that 'tis not every studious or thinking Man, much less every one that is Born, in whom they are to be found clear and distinct: And that one of them, which of all others seems most likely to be Innate, is not so, (I mean the *Idea* of God) I think, in the next Chapter, will appear very evident to any considering Man.

§. 13. From what has been said, I think we may safely conclude, That, *whatever Practical Rule is, in any Place, generally,*

*and with allowance, broken, cannot be supposed Innate*, it being impossible, that Men should, without Shame or Fear, confidently, and serenely break a Rule, which they could not but evidently know, that God had set up, and would certainly punish the breach of (which they must, if it were Innate) to a degree to make it a very ill Bargain to the Transgressor. Without such a Knowledge as this, a Man can never be certain, that any thing is his Duty. Ignorance or Doubt of the Law; hopes to escape the Knowledge or Power of the Law-maker, or the like, may make Men give way to a present Appetite: But let any one see the Fault, and the Rod by it, and with the Transgression, a Fire ready to punish it; a Pleasure tempting, and the Hand of the Almighty visibly held up, and prepared to take Vengeance (for this must be the Case, where any Duty is imprinted on the Mind) and then tell me, whether it be possible, for People, with such a Prospect, such a certain Knowledge as this, wantonly, and without scruple, to offend against a Law, which they carry about them in indelible Characters, and that stares them in the Face, whilst they are breaking it? Whether Men, at the same time that they feel in themselves the imprinted Edicts of an Omnipotent Law-maker, can, with assurance and gaity, slight and trample under Foot his most sacred Injunctions? And lastly, Whether it be possible, that whilst a Man thus openly bids defiance to this Innate Law, and supreme Law-giver, all the By-standers; yea, even the Governours and Rulers of the People, full of the same Sense, both of the Law and Law-maker, should silently connive without testifying their dislike, or laying the least blame on it? Principles of Actions indeed, there are lodged in Mens Appetites, but these are so far from being Innate Moral Principles, that if they were left to their full swing, they would carry Men to the over-turning of all Morality. Moral Laws are set as a Curb and Restraint to these exhorbitant Desires, which they cannot be but by Rewards and Punishments, that will over-balance the satisfaction any one shall propose to himself in the breach of the Law. If therefore any thing be imprinted on the Mind of all Men as a Law, all Men must have a certain and unavoidable Knowledge, that certain, and unavoidable Punishment will attend the Breach of it. For if Men can be ignorant or doubtful of what is Innate, Innate Principles are insisted on, and urged, to no purpose; Truth and Certainty (the things pretended) are not at all secured by them: But Men are in the same uncertain, floating Estate with, as without them. An evident indubitable knowledge of

unavoi-

unavoidable Punishment, great enough to make the Transgression very uneligible, must accompany an Innate Law: Unless with an Innate Law, they can suppose an Innate Gospel too. I would not be here mistaken, as if, because I deny an Innate Law, I thought there were none but positive Laws. There is a great deal of difference between an Innate Law, and a Law of Nature; between something imprinted on our Minds in this very Original, and something that we being ignorant of, may attain to the knowledge of, by the use and due application of our natural Faculties. And I think they equally forsake the Truth, who running into the contrary Extreams, either affirm an Innate Law, or deny that there is a Law, knowable by the Light of Nature; *i. e.* without the help of positive Revelation.

§. 14. The difference there is amongst Men in their Practical Principles, is so evident, that, I think, I need say no more to evince, that it will be impossible to find any Innate Moral Rules, by this mark of general Assent: And 'tis enough to make one suspect, that the Supposition of such Innate Principles, is but an Opinion taken up at Pleasure; since those who talk so confidently of them, are so sparing to *tell* us, *which they are*. This might with Justice be expected from those Men, who lay stress upon this Opinion: And it gives occasion to distrust either their Knowledge or Charity, who declaring, That God has imprinted on the Minds of Men, the Foundations of Knowledge, and the Rules of Living, are yet so little favourable to the Information of their Neighbours, or the Quiet of Mankind, as not to point out to them, which they are, in the Variety Men are distracted with. But in truth, were there any such Innate Principles, there would be no need to teach them. Did Men find such Innate Propositions stamped on their Minds, they would easily be able to distinguish them from other Truths, that they afterwards learned, and deduced from them; and there would be nothing more easy, than to know what, and how many they were. There could be no more doubt about their Number, than there is about the Number of our Fingers; and 'tis like then, every System would be ready to give them us by Tale. But since no Body, that I know, has ventured yet to give a Catalogue of them, they cannot blame those who doubt of the Innate Principles; since even they who require Men to believe, that there are such Innate Propositions, do not tell us what they are. 'Tis easy to foresee, that if different Men of different Sects should go about to

*Those who maintain Innate Practical Principles, tell us not what they are.*

give us a List of those Innate Practical Principles, they would set down only such as suited their distinct Hypothesis, and were fit to support the Doctrines of their particular Schools or Churches: A plain evidence, that there are no such Innate Truths. Nay, a great part of Men are so far from finding any such Innate Moral Principles in themselves, that by denying freedom to Mankind, and thereby making Men no other than bare Machins, they take away not only Innate, but all Moral Rules whatsoever, and leave not a possibility to believe any such, to those who cannot conceive, how any thing can be capable of a Law, that is not a free Agent: And upon that ground, they must necessarily reject all Principles of Vertue, who cannot *put Morality and Mechanism together*; which are not very easy to be reconciled, or made consistent.

*Lord Herbert's Innate Principles examined.*

§. 15. When I had writ this, being informed, that my Lord *Herbert* had in his Books *de Veritate*, assigned these Innate Principles, I presently consulted him, hoping to find, in a Man of so great Parts, something that might satisfy me in this Point, and put an end to my Enquiry. In his Chapter *de Instinctu naturali. p. 76. edit.* 1656. I met with these six Marks of his *notitiæ Communes*. 1. *Prioritas*. 2. *Independentia*. 3. *Universalitas*. 4. *Certitudo*. 5. *Necessitas*. i. e. as he explains it, *faciunt ad hominis conservationem*. 6. *Modus conformationis*, i. e. *Assensus nullâ interpositâ morâ*. And at the latter end of his little Treatise, *De Religione Laici*, he says this of these Innate Principles; *Adeo ut non uniuscujusvis Religionis confinio arctentur quæ ubique vigent veritates. Sunt enim in ipsâ mente cœlitùs descriptæ nulliusque traditionibus, sive scriptis, sive non scriptis, obnoxiæ*, p. 3. And, *Veritates nostræ Catholicæ, quæ tanquam indubia Dei effata in foro interiori descripta*. Thus having given the Marks of the Innate Principles or Common Notions, and asserted their being imprinted on the Minds of Men by the Hand of God, he proceeds to set them down; and they are these: 1. *Esse aliquod supremum numen*. 2. *Numen illud coli debere*. 3. *Virtutem cum pietate conjunctam optimam esse rationem cultûs divini*. 4. *Resipiscendum esse à peccatis*. 5. *Dari præmium vel pœnam post hanc vitam transactam*. Though I allow these to be clear Truths, and such as, if rightly explained, a rational Creature can hardly avoid giving his Assent to: Yet I think he is far from proving them Innate Impressions *in Foro interiori descriptæ*. For I must take leave to observe,

§. 16. First, that these Five Propositions are either not all

of

or more than all, those common Notions writ on our Minds by the finger of God, if it were reasonable to believe any at all to be so written. Since there are other Propositions, which even by his own Rules, have as just a pretence to such an Original, and may be as well admitted for Innate Principles, as, at least, some of these Five he enumerates, *viz. Do as thou wouldst be done unto*: And perhaps, some Hundreds of others, when well considered.

§. 17. *Secondly*, That all his Marks are not to be found in each of his five Propositions, *viz.* his first, second, and third Marks, agree perfectly to neither of them; and the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth Marks, agree but ill to his third, fourth and fifth Propositions. For, besides that, we are assured from History, of many Men, nay, whole Nations, who doubt or disbelieve some or all of them; I cannot see how the third, *viz. That Vertue join'd with Piety, is the best Worship of God*, can be an Innate Principle, when the name, or sound, *Vertue*, is so hard to be understood; liable to so much uncertainty in its signification; and the thing it stands for, so much contended about, and difficult to be known. And therefore this can be but a very uncertain Rule of Humane Practice, and serve but very little to the conduct of our Lives, and is therefore very unfit to be assigned as an Innate practical Principle.

§. 18. For let us consider this Proposition as to its meaning, (for it is the Sense, and not Sound, that is, and must be the Principle or common Notion) *viz. Vertue is the best Worship of God*; i. e. is most acceptable to him; which if *Vertue* be taken, as most commonly it is, for those Actions, which according to the different Opinions of several Countries, are accounted laudable, will be a Proposition so far from being certain, that it will not be true. If *Vertue* be taken for Actions conformable to God's Will, or to the Rule prescribed by God, which is the true and only measure of Vertue, when Vertue is used to signifie what is in its own Nature right and good; then this Proposition, *That Vertue is the best Worship of God*, will be most true and certain, but of very little use in humane Life: since it will amount to no more but this, *viz. That God is pleased with the doing of what he Commands*; which a Man may certainly know to be true, without knowing what it is, that God doth command; and so be as far from any Rule or Principles of his Actions, as he was before: And I think very few will take a Proposition which amounts to no more than this, *viz.* That God is pleased with the doing of what he himself commands, for an

Innate

Innate Moral Principle writ on the Minds of all Men, (however true and certain it may be) since it teaches so little. Whosoever does so, will have reason to think hundreds of Propositions, Innate Principles, since there are many, which have as good a Title, as this, to be received for such, which no Body yet ever put into that rank of Innate Principles.

§. 19. Nor is the fourth Proposition (*viz. Men must repent of their Sins*, much more instructive, till what those Actions are, that are meant by Sins, be set down. For the word *Peccata*, or *Sins*, being put, as it usually is, to signifie in general ill Actions, that will draw on Punishment upon the Doers: What great Principle of Morality can that be, to tell us we should be sorry, and cease to do that, which will bring mischief upon us, without knowing what those particular Actions are, that will do so? Indeed, this is a very true Proposition, and fit to be inculcated on, and received by those, who are supposed, to have been taught, what Actions in all kinds are *Sins*; but neither this, nor the former, can be imagined to be Innate Principles; nor to be of any Use, if they were Innate, unless the particular measures and bounds of all Vertues and Vices, were engraven in Mens Minds, and were Innate Principles also, which I think, is very much to be doubted. And therefore, I imagine, it will scarce seem possible, that God should engrave Principles in Mens Minds, in words of uncertain Signification, such as *Vertues* and *Sins*, which amongst different Men, stand for different things: Nay, it cannot be supposed to be in Words at all, which, being in most of these Principles very general Names, cannot be understood, but by knowing the particulars comprehended under them. And in the practical Instances, the measures must be taken from the Knowledge of the Actions themselves, and the Rules of them abstracted from Words, and antecedent to the knowledge of Names; which Rules a Man must know, what Language soever he chance to learn, whether *English* or *Japan*, or if he should learn no Language at all, or never should understand the use of Words, as happens in the case of Dumb and Deaf Men. When it shall be made out, that Men ignorant of Words, or untaught by the Laws and Customs of their Country, know that it is part of the Worship of God, Not to Kill another Man; Not to know more Women than one; Not to procure Abortion; Not to expose their Children; Not to take from another what is his, though we want it our selves, but on the contrary, relieve and supply his Wants; and whenever we have done the contrary,

we ought to repent, be sorry, and resolve to do so no more: When, I say, all Men shall be proved actually to know, and allow all these and a Thousand other such Rules, all which come under these two general Words made use of above, *viz. Virtutes & Peccata, Vertues* and *Sins*, there will be more reason for admitting these and the like, for Common Notions, and Practical Principles; yet after all, universal Consent (were there any in Moral Principles) to Truths, the knowledge whereof may be attained otherwise, would scarce prove them to be Innate; which is all I Contend for.

Obj. *Innate Principles may be corrupted, answered.*

§. 20. Nor will it be of much moment here, to offer that very ready, but not very material Answer, (*viz.*) That the *Innate Principles* of Morality, *may, by Education, and Custom*, and the general Opinion of those, amongst whom we converse, *be darkened*, and at last *quite worn out* of the Minds of Men. Which Assertion of theirs, if true, quite takes away the Argument of universal Consent, by which this Opinion of Innate Principles is endeavoured to be proved; unless those Men will think it reasonable, that their private Perswasions, or that of their Party, should pass for universal Consent; a thing not unfrequently done, when Men, presuming themselves to be the only Masters of right Reason, cast by the Votes and Opinions of the rest of Mankind, as not worthy the reckoning. And then their Argument stands thus: The Principles which all Mankind allow for true, are Innate; those that Men of right Reason admit, are the Principles allowed by all Mankind; we and those of our mind, are Men of Reason; therefore we agreeing, our Principles are Innate; which is a very pretty way of arguing, and a short Cut to Infallibility. For otherwise it will be very hard to understand, how there be some Principles, which all Men do acknoledge, and agree in; and yet there are none of those *Principles*, which are *not by depraved Custom, and ill Education, blotted out* of the Minds of many Men: Which is to say, That all Men admit, but yet many Men do deny, and dissent from them. And indeed the Supposition of such first Principles, will serve us to very little purpose; and we shall be as much at a loss with, as without them, if they may by any Humane Power, such as is the Will of our Teachers, or Opinions of our Companions, be altered or lost in us: And notwithstanding all this Boast of first Principles, and Innate Light, we shall be as much in the dark and uncertainty, as if there were no such thing at all: It being all one to have no Rule, and one

that

that will warp any way; or amongst various and contrary Rules, not to know which is the right. But concerning Innate Principles, I desire these Men to say, whether they can, or cannot, by Education and Custom, be blurr'd and blotted out: If they cannot, we must find them in all Mankind alike, and they must be clear in every body: And if they may suffer variation from adventitious Notions, we must then find them clearest and most perspicuous, nearest the Fountain, in Children and Illiterate People, who have received least impression from foreign Opinions. Let them take which side they please, they will certainly find it inconsistent with visible matter of Fact, and daily Observation.

*Contrary Principles in the World.*

§. 21. I easily grant, that there are great Number of *Opinions*, which, by Men of different Countries, Educations, and Tempers, are received and *embraced as first and unquestionable Principles*; *many whereof*, both for their Absurdity, as well as Oppositions one to another, *it is impossible should be true.* But yet all those Propositions, how remote soever from Reason, are so sacred somewhere or other, that Men even of good Understanding in other matters, will sooner part with their Lives, and whatever is dearest to them, than suffer themselves to doubt, or others to question, the truth of them.

*How Men commonly come by their Principles.*

§. 22. This, however strange it may seem, is that which every Days Experience confirms; and will not, perhaps, appear so wonderful, if we consider the *Ways* and *Steps by which* it is brought about; and how really it may come to pass, that *Doctrines*, that have been derived from no better Original, than the Superstition of a Nurse, or the Authority of an old Woman; may, by length of Time, and consent of Neighbours, *grow up to the Dignity of Principles* in Religion or Morality. For such, who are careful (as they call it) to Principle Children well, (and few there be who have not a set of those Principles for them, which they believe in) instil into the unwary, and, as yet, unprejudiced Understanding, (for White Paper receives any Characters) those Doctrines they would have them retain and profess. These being taught them as soon as they have any apprehension; and still as they grow up, confirmed to them, either by the open Profession, or tacit Consent, of all they have to do with; or at least by those, of whose Wisdom, Knowledge, and Piety, they have an Opinion, who never suffer those Propositions to be otherwise mentioned, but as

the

the Basis and Foundation, on which they build their Religion or Manners, come, by these means to have the reputation of Unquestionable, Self-evident, and Innate Truths.

§. 23. To which we may add, That when *Men*, so instructed are grown up, and reflect on their own Minds, they cannot find any thing more ancient there, than those Opinions, which were taught them, before their Memory began to keep a Register of their Actions, or Date the Time, when any new Thing appeared to them; and therefore make no scruple to *conclude, That those Propositions, of whose knowledge they can find in themselves no Original, were certainly the impress of God and Nature* upon their Minds; and not taught them by any one else. These they entertain and submit to, as many do to their Parents, with Veneration; not because it is natural; nor do Children do it, where they are not so taught; but because, having been always so Educated, and having no remembrance of the beginning of this Respect, they think it is natural.

§. 24. This will appear very likely, and almost unavoidable to come to pass, if we consider the Nature of Mankind, and the Constitution of Humane Affairs; wherein *most Men cannot live, without employing their time in the daily Labours of their Callings; nor be at quiet in their Minds, without some Foundation or Principles to rest their Thoughts on.* There is scarce any one so floating and superficial in his Understanding, who hath not some reverenced Propositions, which are to him the Principles on which he bottoms his Reasonings; and by which he judgeth of Truth and Falshood, Right and Wrong; which some, wanting Skill and Leisure, and others the Inclination, and some being taught, that they ought not to examine; there are few to be found, who are not exposed by their Ignorance, Laziness, Education, or Precipitancy, to *take them upon trust.*

§. 25. This is evidently the Case of all Children and Young Folk; and Custom, a greater power than Nature, seldom failing to make them worship for Divine, what she hath inured them to bow their Minds, and submit their Understandings to, it is no wonder, that grown *Men*, either perplexed in the necessary affairs of Life, or hot in the pursuit of Pleasures, should *not* seriously sit down to *examin their own Tenets*; especially when one of their Principles is, That Principles ought not to be questioned. And had Men Leisure, Parts, and Will, Who is there almost, that dare shake the Foundations of all his past Thoughts and Actions, and endure to bring upon himself, the shame of having been a long time wholly in Mistake and Error? Who

is

is there, hardy enough to contend with the reproach, which is every where prepared for those, who dare venture to dissent from the received Opinions of their Country or Party? And where is the Man to be found, that can patiently prepare himself to bear the Name of Whimsical, Sceptical, or Atheist, which he is sure to meet with, who does in the least scruple any of the common Opinions? And he will be much more *afraid to question those Principles*, when he shall think them, as most Men do, the Standards set up by God in his Mind, to be the Rule and Touchstone of all other Opinions. And what can hinder him from thinking them Sacred, when he finds them the earliest of all his own Thoughts, and the most reverenced by others.

§. 26. It is easy to imagine, *how* by these means it comes to pass, that *Men* worship the Idols that have been set up in their Minds; grow fond of the Notions they have been long acquainted with there; and *stamp the Characters of Divinity, upon Absurdities and Errors*, become zealous Votaries to Bulls and Monkeys; and contend too, fight, and die in defence of their Opinions. *Dum solos credit habendos esse Deos, quos ipse colit.* For since the reasoning Faculties of the Soul, which are, almost constantly, though not always warily nor wisely employ'd, would not know how to move, for want of a foundation and footing, in most Men, who through Laziness or Avocation, do not; or for want of Time, or true Helps, or for other Causes, cannot, penetrate into the Principles of Knowledge, and trace Truth to its Fountain and Original, 'tis natural for them, and almost unavoidable, to take up with some borrowed Principles; which being reputed and presumed to be the evident proofs of other things, are thought not to need any other proof themselves. Whoever shall receive any of these into his Mind, and entertain them there, with the reverence usually paid to Principles, never venturing to examine them; but accustoming himself to believe them, because they are to be believed, may take up from his Education, and the fashions of his Country, any absurdity for Innate Principles; and by long poring on the same Objects, so dim his sight, as to take Monsters lodged in his own Brain, for the Images of the Deity, and the Workmanship of his Hands.

*Principles must be examined.*

§. 27. By this progress, how many there are, who arrive at Principles, which they believe Innate, may be easily observed, in the variety of opposite Principles, held, and contended for, by all sorts and degrees of Men. And he that shall deny this

this to be the Method, wherein moſt Men proceed to the aſſurance they have, of the truth and evidence of their Principles, will perhaps, find it a hard matter, any other way to account for the contrary Tenets, which are firmly believed, confidently aſſerted, and which great Numbers are ready at any time to ſeal with their Blood. And, indeed, if it be the privilege of Innate Principles, to be received upon their own Authority, without examination, I know not what may not be believed, or how any one's *Principles* can be queſtioned. If they may, and *ought to be examined*, and tried, I deſire to know how Firſt and Innate Principles can be tried; or at leaſt it is reaſonable to demand the Marks and Characters, whereby the genuine, Innate Principles, may be diſtinguiſhed from others; that ſo, amidſt the great variety of Pretenders, I may be kept from miſtakes, in ſo material a Point as this. When this is done, I ſhall be ready to embrace ſuch welcome, and uſeful Propoſitions; and till then I may with Modeſty doubt, ſince I fear univerſal Conſent, which is the only one produced, will ſcarce prove a ſufficient mark to direct my Choice, and aſſure me of any Innate Principles. From what has been ſaid, I think it paſt doubt, that there are no Practical Principles wherein all Men agree; and therefore none Innate.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Other Conſiderations concerning Innate Principles, both Speculative and Practical.*

§. 1. HAD thoſe, who would perſwade us, that there are Innate Principles, not taken them together in groſs; but conſidered, ſeparately, the parts, out of which thoſe Propoſitions are made, they would not, perhaps, have been ſo forward to believe they were Innate. Since, if the *Ideas*, which made up thoſe Truths, were not, it was impoſſible, that the Propoſitions, made up of them, ſhould be Innate, or our Knowledge of them be born with us. For if the *Ideas* be not *Innate*, there was a time, when the Mind was without thoſe Principles; and then, they will not be Innate, but be derived from ſome other Original. For, where the *Ideas* themſelves

*Principles not Innate, unleſs their* Ideas *be Innate.*

selves are not, there can be no Knowledge, no Assent, no Mental, or Verbal Propositions about them.

*Ideas especially those belonging to Principles not Born with Children.*

§. 2. If we will attentively consider new Born *Children*, we shall have little Reason to think, that they bring many *Ideas* into the World with them. For, baring, perhaps, some faint *Ideas*, of Hunger, and Thirst, and Warmth, and some Pains, which they may *have* felt in the Womb, there is *not* the least appearance of any setled *Ideas* at all in them; especially of *Ideas*, *answering the Terms*, *which make up those universal Propositions*, that are esteemed Innate Principles. One may perceive how, by degrees, afterwards, *Ideas* come into their Minds; and that they get no more, nor no other, than what Experience, and the Observation of things, that come in their way, furnish them with; which might be enough to satisfy us, that they are not Original Characters, stamped on the Mind.

§. 3. *It is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, is certainly (if there be any such) an Innate Principle. But can any one think, or will any one say, that *Impossibility* and *Identity*, are too Innate *Ideas*? Are they such as all Mankind have, and bring into the World with them? And are they those, that are the first in Children, and antecedent to all acquired ones? If they are Innate, they must needs be so: Hath a Child an *Idea* of *Impossibility* and *Identity*, before it has of *White* or *Black*; *Sweet* or *Bitter*? And is it from the Knowledge of this Principle, that it concludes, that Wormwood rubb'd on the Nipple, hath not the same Taste, that it used to receive from thence? Is it the actual Knowledge of *Impossibile est idem esse, & non esse*, that makes a Child distinguish between its Mother and a Stranger; or that makes it fond of the one, and fly the other? Or does the Mind regulate it self, and its assent by *Ideas*, that it never yet had? Or the Understanding draw Conclusions from Principles, which it never yet knew or understood? The Names *Impossibility* and *Identity*, stand for two *Ideas*, so *far from being Innate*, or Born with us, that I think it requires great Care and Attention, to form them right in our Understandings. They are so far from being brought into the World with us; so remote from the thoughts of Infancy and Childhood, that I believe, upon Examination, it will be found, that many grown Men want them.

*Identity, an Idea not Innate.*

§. 4. If *Identity* (to instance in that alone) be a native Impression; and consequently so clear and

and obvious to us, that we must needs know it even from our Cradles; I would gladly be resolved, by one of Seven, or Seventy Years old, Whether a Man, being a Creature, consisting of Soul and Body, be the same Man, when his Body is Changed? Whether *Euphorbus* and *Pythagoras*, having had the same Soul, were the same Man, though they lived several Ages asunder? Nay, Whether the Cock too, which had the same Soul, were not the same with both of them? Whereby, perhaps, it will appear, that our *Idea of Sameness*, is *not* so settled and clear, as to deserve to be thought *Innate* in us. For if those Innate *Ideas*, are not clear and distinct, so as to be universally known, and naturally agreed on, they cannot be Subjects of universal, and undoubted Truths; but will be the unavoidable Occasion of perpetual uncertainty. For, I suppose, every one's *Idea* of *Identity*, will not be the same, that *Pythagoras* and Thousands others of his Followers have: And which then shall be the true? Which Innate? Or are there two different *Ideas* of *Identity*, both Innate?

§. 5. Nor let any one think, that the Questions, I have here proposed, about the *Identity* of Man, are bare, empty Speculations; which if they were, would be enough to shew, That there was in the Understandings of Men *no Innate* Idea *of* Identity. He, that shall, with a little attention, reflect on the Resurrection, and consider, that Divine Justice shall bring to Judgment, at the last Day, the very same Persons, to be happy or miserable in the other, who did well or ill in this Life, will find it perhaps, not easy to resolve with himself, what makes the same Man, or wherein *Identity* consists: And will not be forward to think he, and every one, even Children themselves, have naturally a clear *Idea* of it.

*Whole and Part not Innate Ideas.*

§. 6. Let us examine that Principle of Mathematicks, *viz.* *That the whole is bigger than a part.* This, I take it, is reckon'd amongst Innate Principles. I am sure it has as good a Title, as any, to be thought so; which yet, no Body can think it to be, when he considers the *Ideas* it comprehends in it, *Whole* and *Part*, are perfectly Relative; but the Positive *Ideas*, to which they properly and immediately belong, are Extention and Number, of which alone, *Whole* and *Part*, are Relations. So that if *Whole* and *Part* are Innate *Ideas*, Extension and Number must be so too; it being Impossible to have an *Idea* of a Relation, without having any at all of the thing to which it belongs, and in which it is founded. Now, Whether the Minds of Men have natu-

rally imprinted on them the *Ideas* of Extension and Number, I leave to be considered by those, who are the Patrons of Innate Principles.

*Idea of Worship not Innate.*

§. 7. That *God is to be worshipped*, is, without doubt, as great a Truth as any can enter into the Mind of Man, and deserves the first place amongst all Practical Principles. But yet, it can by no means be thought Innate, unless the *Ideas* of *God* and *Worship*, are Innate. That the *Idea*, the Term *Worship* stands for, is not in the Understanding of Children, and a Character stamped on the Mind in its first Original, I think, will be easily granted, by any one, that considers how few there be, amongst grown Men, who have a clear and distinct Notion of it. And, I suppose, there cannot be any thing more ridiculous, than to say, that Children have this Practical Principle Innate, *That God is to be worshipped*; and yet, that they know not what that Worship of God is, which is their Duty. But to pass by this,

*Idea of God not Innate.*

§. 8. If any *Idea* can be imagin'd *Innate*, the *Idea of God* may, of all others, for many Reasons, be thought so; since it is hard to conceive, how there should be Innate Moral Principles, without an Innate *Idea* of a *Deity*: Without a Notion of a Law-maker, it is impossible to have a Notion of a Law, and an Obligation to observe it. Besides the Atheists, taken notice of amongst the Ancients, and left branded upon the Records of History, hath not Navigation discovered, in these latter Ages, whole Nations, at the Bay of *Soldania*, (*a*) in *Brasil*, (*b*) in *Boranday*, (*c*) and the *Caribee* Islands, &c. amongst whom there was to be found no Notion of a God, no Religion. *Nicholaus del Techo in literis, ex Paraquaria de Caaiguarum conversione*, has these Words (*d*) *Reperi eam gentem nullum nomen habere, quod Deum, & Hominis animam significet, nulla sacra habet, nulla Idola.* These are Instances of Nations where uncultivated Nature has been left to it self, without the help of Letters, and Discipline, and the Improvements of Arts and Sciences. But there are others to be found, who have enjoy'd these in a very great measure, who yet, for want of a due application of their thoughts this way, want the *Idea*, and Knowledge of God. 'Twill I doubt not be a Surprise to others, as it was to me, to find the *Siamites* of this number. But for this, let them consult

(a) Rhoea apud *Thevenot*, *pag.* 2.

(b) *Jo. de Lery*, *c.* 16.

(c) *Martiniere* $\frac{201}{324}$. *Terry* $\frac{17}{345}$. & $\frac{22}{345}$. *Ovington* $\frac{389}{686}$.

(*d*) Relatio triplex de rebus Indicis Caaiguarum $\frac{43}{70}$.

consult the King of *France*'s late Envoy thither, (*e*) who gives no better account of the *Chineses* themselves. (*f*) And if we will not believe *La Loubere*, the Missionaries of *China*, even the Jesuits themselves, the great Encomiasts of the *Chineses*, do all to a Man agree and will convince us that the Sect of the *Litterati*, or *Learned*, keeping to the old Religion of *China*, and the ruling Party there, are all of them *Atheist*. Vid. *Navarette* in the Collection of Voyages, Vol. the First, and *Historia cultus Sinensium*. And, perhaps, if we should, with attention, mind the Lives, and Discourses of People not so far off, we should have too much Reason to fear, that many in more civilized Countries, have no very strong, and clear Impressions of a Deity upon their Minds; and that the Complaints of Atheism, made from the Pulpit, are not without Reason: And though only some profligate Wretches own it too bare-facedly now; yet, perhaps, we should hear, more than we do of it, from others, did not the fear of the Magistrate's Sword, or their Neighbour's Censure, tie up Peoples Tongues; which, were the Apprehensions of Punishment, or Shame taken away, would as openly proclaim their *Atheism*, as their Lives do. (2)

(*e*) La Loubere du Royaume de Siam, T. 1 c. 9. *sect.* 15. &c. 20. *sect.* 22. &c. 22 *sect.* 6.

(*f*) *Ib. Tom.* 1. c. 20. *sect.* 4. &c. 23.

§. 9.

(2) On this Reasoning of the Author against Innate *Ideas*, great blame hath been laid; because it seems to invalidate an Argument commonly used to prove the Being of a God, *viz. Universal Consent*: To which our Author † Answers, *I think that the* Universal Consent *of Mankind, as to the Being of a God, amounts to thus much, That the vastly greater Majority of Mankind, have in all Ages of the World, actually believed a God; that the Majority of the remaining part, have not actually disbelieved it; and consequently those who have actually opposed the belief of a God, have truly been very few.* So that comparing those that have actually dis-believed, with those who have actually believed a God, their Number is so inconsiderable, that in respect of this incomparably greater Majority, of those who have owned the belief of a God, it may be said to be the *Universal Consent* of Mankind.

† *In his Third Letter to the Bishop of* Worcester, *pag.* 447. &c.

This is all the *Universal Consent* which Truth of matter of Fact will allow; and therefore all that can be made use of to prove a God. But if any one would extend it farther, and speak deceitfully for God: If this Universality should be urged in a strict Sense, not for much the Majority, but for a general *Consent* of every one, even to a Man, in all Ages and Countries; this would make it either no Argument, or a perfectly useless and unnecessary one. For if any one deny a God, such a perfect universality of Con-

§. 9. But had all Mankind, every-where, a *Notion of a God*, (whereof yet History tells us the contrary) it would *not* from thence follow, that the *Idea* of him was *Innate*. For, though no Nation were to be found without a Name, and some few dark Notions of him; yet that would not prove them to be natural Impressions on the Mind, no more than the Names of Fire, or the Sun, Heat, or Number, do prove the *Ideas* they stand for, to be Innate; because the Names of those things, and the *Ideas* of them, are so universally received, and known amongst Mankind. Nor on the contrary, is the want of such a Name, or the absence of such a Notion out of Men's Minds, any Argument against the Being of a God, any more, than it would be a Proof, that there was no Load-stone in the World, because a great part of Mankind, had neither a Notion of any such thing, nor a Name for it; or be any shew of Argument to prove, that there are no distinct and various Species of Angels, or intelligent Beings above us, because we have no *Ideas* of such distinct Species, or Names for them: For Men being furnished with

---

sent is destroy'd; and if no Body does deny a God, what need of Arguments to convince *Atheists*?

I would crave leave to ask your Lordship, Were there ever in the World any *Atheists* or no? If there were not, what need is there of raising a Question about the Being of a God, when no Body questions it? What need of provisional Arguments against a fault, from which Mankind are so wholly free; and which by an *Universal Consent*, they may be presumed to be secure from? If you say (as I doubt not but you will) that there have been *Atheists* in the World, then your Lordship's *Universal Consent*, reduces it self to only a great Majority, and then make that Majority as great as you will, what I have said in the place quoted by your Lordship, leaves it in its full force; and I have not said one Word, that does in the least *invalidate this Argument* for a God. The Argument I was upon there, was to shew, that the *Idea* of God was not Innate; and to my purpose it was sufficient, if there were but a less Number found in the World, who had no *Idea* of God, than your Lordship will allow there have been of professed *Atheists*; for whatsoever is Innate, must be Universal in the strictest Sense: One Exception is a sufficient Proof against it. So that all that I said, and which was quite to another purpose, did not at all tend, nor can be made use of, to *invalidate the Argument* for a Deity, grounded on such an *Universal Consent*, as your Lordship, and all that build on it, must own; which is only a very disproportioned Majority: Such an *Universal Consent* my Argument there, neither affirms nor requires to be less, than you will be pleased to allow it. Your Lordship therefore might without any prejudice to those Declarations of good-will and favour you have for the Author of the *Essay of Humane Understanding*, have spared the mentioning his quoting Authors that

with Words, by the common Language of their own Countries, can scarce avoid having some kind of *Ideas* of those things, whose Names, those they converse with, have occasion frequently to mention to them: And if it carry with it the Notion of Excellency, Greatness, or something extraordinary; if Apprehension and Concernment accompany it; if the Fear of absolute and irresistible Power set it on upon the Mind, the *Idea* is likely to sink the deeper, and spread the farther; especially if it be such an *Idea*, as is agreeable to the common Light of Reason, and naturally deducible from every part of our Knowledge, as that of a God is. For the visible marks of extraordinary Wisdom and Power, appear so plainly in all the Works of the Creation, that a rational Creature, who will but seriously reflect on them, cannot miss the discovery of a *Deity*: And the influence, that the discovery of such a Being must necessarily have on the Minds of all, that have but once heard of it, is so great, and carries such a weight of Thought and Communication with it, that

---

that are in Print, for matters of Fact, to quite another purpose, *as going about to invalidate the Argument for a* Deity, *from the Universal Consent of Mankind*, since he leaves that *Universal Consent* as entire and as large as you your self do, or can own, or suppose it. But here I *have no reason to be sorry that* your Lordship *has given me this occasion for the Vindication of this Passage of my Book*: If there should be any one besides your Lordship who should so far mistake it, as to think it in the least *invalidates the Argument* for a God, *from the Universal Consent of Mankind.*

But because you question the Credibility of those Authors I have quoted, which you say *were very ill chosen*: I will crave leave to say, That he whom I relied on for his Testimony concerning the *Hotentots* of *Saldania*, was no less a Man, than an Ambassador from the King of *England* to the *Great Mogul*. Of whose Relation, Monsieur *Thevenot*, no ill Judge in the Case, had so great an Esteem, that he was at the Pains to Translate it into *French*, and publish it in his (which is counted no unjudicious) Collection of *Travels*. But to intercede with your Lordship, for a little more favourable allowance of Credit to Sir *Thomas Roe*'s Relation; *Coore*, an Inhabitant of the Country who could speak *English*, assured * Mr. *Terry*, That they of *Soldania* had no God. But if he too have the ill Luck to find no Credit with you, I hope you will be a little more favourable to a Divine of the Church of *England* now living, and admit of his Testimony in confirmation of Sir *Thomas Roe*'s. This worthy Gentleman, in the Relation of his Voyage to *Surat*, Printed but two Years since, speaking of the same People, has these Words, (†) *They are sunk even below Idolatry, are destitute of both Priest and Temple, and saving a little shew of Rejoycing, which is made at the Full and New*

* Terry's *Voyage, p.* 17. *and* 23.

(†) *Mr.* Ovington, *page* 489.

that it seems strange to me, that a whole Nation of Men should be any-where found so Brutish, as to want the Notion of a God; than that they should be without any Notion of Numbers, or Fire.

§. 10. The Name of God being once mentioned in any part of the World, to express a superior, powerful, wise, invisible Being, the suitableness of such a Notion to the Principles of common Reason, and the Interest Men will always have to mention it often, must necessarily spread it far and wide; and continue it down to all Generations; though yet the general *reception of this Name, and some imperfect and unsteady Notions, conveyed thereby,* to the unthinking part of Mankind, *prove not the* Idea *to be Innate*; but only that they, who made the Discovery, had made a right use of their Reason, thought maturely of the Causes of things, and traced them to their Original; from whom other less considering People, having once received so important a Notion, it could not easily be lost again.

---

*Moon, have lost all kind of Religious Devotion. Nature has so richly provided for their Convenience in this Life, that they have drowned all sense of the God of it, and are grown quite careless of the next.*

But to provide against the clearest Evidence of *Atheism* in these People, you say, *That the Account given of them, makes them not fit to be a Standard for the sense of Mankind.* This, I think, may pass for nothing, till some Body may be found, *that makes them to be a Standard for the sense of Mankind.* All the use I made of them was to shew, That there were Men in the World, that had no Innate *Idea* of God. But to keep something like an Argument going (for what will not that do?) You go near denying those *Cafers* to be Men, What else do these Words signifie? *A People so strangely bereft of Common Sense, that they can hardly be reckon'd among Mankind, as appears by the best Accounts of the* Cafers *of* Soldania, *&c.* I hope if any of them were called *Peter, James,* or *John,* it would be past scruple that they were Men: However, *Courwee, Wewena,* and *Cousheda,* and those others who had Names, that had no places in your *Nomenclator,* would hardly pass Muster with your Lordship.

My Lord, I should not mention this, but that what you your self say here, may be a Motive to you to consider; That what you have laid such stress on concerning the *general Nature of Man,* as a *real Being and the subject of Properties,* amounts to nothing for the distinguishing of *Species,* since you your self own that there may be *Individuals wherein there is a common Nature with a particular subsistence proper to each of them,* whereby you are so little able to know of which of the *Rangs* or *Sorts* they are, into which you say, *God has order'd Beings,* and which he *hath distinguished by essential Properties,* that you are in doubt whether *they ought to be reckon'd among Mankind or no.*

§. 11.

§. 11. This is all could be inferr'd from the Notion of a *God*, were it to be found universally in all the Tribes of Mankind, and generally acknowledged, by Men grown to maturity in all Countries. For the generality of the acknowledging of a God, as I imagine, is extended no farther than that; which if it be sufficient to prove the *Idea of God, Innate*, will as well prove the *Idea* of Fire, Innate; since, I think, it may truly be said, That there is not a Person in the World, who has a Notion of a *God*, who has not also the *Idea* of Fire. I doubt not; but if a Colony of young Children should be placed in an Island, where no Fire was, they would certainly neither have any Notion of such a thing, nor Name for it, how generally soever it were received, and known in all the World besides; and perhaps too, their Apprehensions would be as far removed from any Name, or Notion of a God, 'till some one amongst them had imployed his Thoughts, to enquire into the Constitution and Causes of things, which would easily lead him to the Notion of a *God*; which having once taught to others, Reason, and the natural Propensity of their own Thoughts, would afterwards propagate, and continue amongst them.

*Suitable to* GOD's *Goodness, that all Men should have an* Idea *of him, therefore naturally imprinted by him; answer'd.*

§. 12. Indeed it is urged, That it is *suitable to the Goodness of God, to imprint, upon the Minds of Men, Characters and Notions of Himself*, and not to leave them in the dark, and doubt, in so grand a Concernment; and also by that means, to secure to himself the Homage and Veneration, due from so intelligent a Creature as Man; and therefore he has done it.

This Argument, if it be of any force, will prove much more than those, who use it in this Case, expect from it. For if we may conclude, that *God* hath done for Men, all that Men shall judge is best for them, because it is suitable to his Goodness so to do, it will prove, not only, that God has imprinted on the Minds of Men an *Idea* of Himself; but that he hath plainly stamped there, in fair Characters, all that Men ought to know, or believe of Him, all that they ought to do in obedience to his Will; and that he hath given them a Will and Affections conformable to it. This, no doubt, every one will think it better for Men, than that they should, in the dark, grope after Knowledge, as St. *Paul* tells us all Nations did after God, *Acts* XVII. 27. than that their Wills should clash with their Understandings, and their Appetites cross their Duty. The *Romanists* say, 'Tis best for Men, and so suitable to the Goodness of

God, that there should be an infallible Judge of Controversies on Earth; and therefore there is one: And I, by the same Reason, say, 'Tis better for Men that every Man himself should be infallible. I leave them to consider, whether by the force of this Argument they shall think, that every Man is so. I think it a very good Argument, to say, the infinitely wise God hath made it so: And therefore it is best. But it *seems to me a little too much Confidence of our own Wisdom, to say, I think it best, and therefore God hath made it so*; and in the Matter in hand, it will be in vain to argue from such a Topick, that God hath done so, when certain Experience shews us, that he hath not. But the Goodness of God hath not been wanting to Men without such Original Impressions of Knowledge, or *Ideas* stamped on the Mind: Since he hath furnished Man with those Faculties, which will serve for the sufficient discovery of all things requisite to the End of such a Being; and I doubt not but to shew that a Man by the right Use of his natural Abilities, may, without any innate Principles, attain the Knowledge of a God, and other things that concern him. God having endued Man with those Faculties of Knowing which he hath, was no more obliged by his Goodness, to implant those innate Notions in his Mind, than that having given him Reason, Hands, and Materials, he should build him Bridges, or Houses, which some People in the World, however of good Parts, do either totally want, or are but ill provided of, as well as others are wholly without *Ideas of God*, and Principles of Morality; or at least have but very ill ones. The Reason in both cases being, That they never employ'd their Parts, Faculties, and Powers, industriously that way, but contented themselves with the Opinions, Fashions, and Things, of their Country, as they found them, without looking any farther. Had you or I been born at the Bay of *Soldania*, possibly our Thoughts, and Notions, had not exceeded those brutish ones of the *Hotentots* that inhabit there: And had the *Virginia* King *Apochancana*, been educated in *England*, he had, perhaps, been as knowing a Divine, and as good a Mathematician, as any in it. The difference between him, and a more improved *English*-man, lying barely in this, that exercise of his Faculties was bounded within the Ways, Modes, and Notions of his own Country, and never directed to any other, or farther Enquiries: And if he had not any *Idea* of a God, it was only because he pursued not those Thoughts, that would have led him to it.

§. 13. I grant, That *if* there were *any Ideas* to be found *imprinted*

*printed* on the Minds of Men, we have Reason to expect, *it should be the Notion of his Maker*, as a mark GOD set on his own Workmanship, to mind Man of his Dependance and Duty; and that herein should appear the first Instances of humane Knowledge. But how late is it before any such notion is discoverable in Children? And when we find it there, how much more does it resemble the Opinion, and Notion of the Teacher, than represent the true God? he that shall observe in Children, the progress whereby their Minds attain the Knowledge they have, will think, that the Objects they do first, and most familiarly converse with, are those that make the first impressions on their Understandings: Nor will he find the least footsteps of any other. It is easie to take notice, how their Thoughts enlarge themselves, only as they come to be acquainted with a greater variety of sensible Objects, to retain the *Ideas* of them in their Memories; and to get the skill to compound and enlarge them, and several ways put them together. How by these means they come to frame in their Minds an *Idea* Men have of a Deity, I shall hereafter shew.

*Ideas of* GOD *various in different Men.*

§. 14. Can it be thought, that the *Ideas* Men have of God, are the Characters, and Marks of Himself, engraven in their Minds by his own Finger, when we see, that in the same Country, under one and the same Name, *Men have far different*, nay, often *contrary and inconsistent Ideas* and Conceptions *of him*? Their agreeing in a Name, or Sound, will scarce prove an innate Notion of Him.

§. 15. What true or tolerable Notion of a *Deity*, could they have, who acknowledged, and worshipped hundreds? Every Deity, that they owned above one, was an infallible evidence of their ignorance of Him, and a proof, that they had no true Notion of God, where Unity, Infinity, and Eternity, were excluded. To which if we add their gross Conceptions of Corporeity, expressed in their Images, and Representations of their Deities; the Amours, Marriages, Copulations, Lusts, Quarrels, and other mean Qualities, attributed by them to their Gods; we shall have little reason to think, that the heathen World, *i. e.* the greatest part of Mankind, had such *Ideas* of God in their Minds, as he Himself, out of care, that they should not be mistaken about Him, was Author of. And this Universality of Consent, so much argued, if it prove any native impressions, 'twill be only this: That God imprinted on the minds of all Men, speaking the same Language, a Name for himself, but

not

not any *Idea*: Since those People, who agreed in the Name, at the same time, far different Apprehensions about the thing signified. If they say, That the variety of Deities worshipped by the heathen World, were but figurative ways of expressing the several Attributes of that incomprehensible Being, or several parts of his Providence: I answer, what they might be in their Original, I will not here enquire; but that they were so in the Thoughts of the Vulgar, I think no body will affirm: And he that will consult the Voyage of the Bishop of *Beryte*, c. 13. (not to mention other Testimonies) will find, that the Theology of the *Siamites*, professedly owns a plurality of Gods: Or, as the *Abbe de Choisy* more judiciously remarks, in his Journal *du Voyage de Siam*, $\frac{1685}{1687}$, it consists properly in acknowledging no God at all.

§. 15. If it be said, That *wise Men* of all Nations came to *have true Conceptions* of the Unity and Infinity *of the Deity*, I grant it. But then this,

*First*, Excludes universality of Consent in any thing, but the Name, for those wise Men being very few, perhaps one of a thousand, this Universality is very narrow.

*Secondly*, It seems to me plainly to prove that the truest and best Notions Men had of God, were not imprinted, but acquired by Thought and Meditation, and a right Use of their Faculties. Since the wise and considerate Men of the World, by a right and careful employment of their Thoughts and Reason, attained true Notions in this, as well as other things; whilst the lazy and inconsiderate part of Men, making the far greater Number, took up their Notions, by chance, from common Tradition and vulgar Conceptions, without much beating their Heads about them. And if it be a reason to think *the notion of God Innate*, because all wise Men had it, Vertue too must be thought Innate; for that also wise Men have always had.

§. 16. This was evidently the case of all *Gentilism*: Nor hath even amongst *Jews*, *Christians*, and *Mahometans*, who acknowledge but one God, this Doctrine, and the care is taken in those Nations to teach Men, to have true Notions of a GOD, prevailed so far, as to make Men to have the same, and true *Ideas* of him. How many, even amongst us, will be found upon enquiry, to fancy him in the shape of a Man, sitting in Heaven; and to have many other absurd and unfit Conceptions of him? Christians, as well as Turks, have had whole Sects owning, and contending earnestly for it, that the Deity was corporeal, and of humane shape: And though we find few amongst

us, who profeſs themſelves *Anthropomorphites*, (though ſome I have met with, that own it) yet, I believe, he that will make it his buſineſs, may find amongſt the ignorant, and uninſtructed Chriſtians, many of that Opinion. Talk but with Country-people, almoſt of any Age; or young People, almoſt of any Condition, and you ſhall find, that though the Name of GOD be frequently in their Mouths; yet the Notions they apply this Name to, are ſo odd, low, and pitiful, that no body can imagine they were taught by a rational Man; much leſs, that they were Characters writ by the Finger of God himſelf. Nor do I ſee how it derogates more from the Goodneſs of God, that he has given us Minds unfurniſhed with theſe *Ideas* of Himſelf, than that he hath ſent us into the World, with Bodies uncloathed: and that there is no Art or Skill born with us. For being fitted with Faculties to attain theſe, it is want of Induſtry, and Conſideration in us, and not of Bounty in Him, if we have them not. 'Tis as certain, that there is a God, as that the oppoſite Angles, made by the interſection of two ſtrait Lines, are equal. There was never any rational Creature, that ſet himſelf ſincerely to examine the Truth of theſe Propoſitions, that could fail to aſſent to them: Though yet be paſt doubt that there are many Men, who having not applied their Thoughts that way, are ignorant both of the one and the other. If any one think fit to call this (which is the utmoſt of its extent) Univerſal Conſent, ſuch an one I eaſily allow: But ſuch an Univerſal Conſent as this, proves not the *Idea* of *God*, no more than it does the *Idea* of ſuch Angles, *Innate*.

*If the* Idea *of* God *be not Innate, no other can be ſuppoſed Innate.*

§. 17. Since then though the knowledge of a GOD, be the moſt natural diſcovery of humane Reaſon, yet *the Idea of Him*, is *not Innate*, as, I think, is evident from what has been ſaid; I imagine there will be ſcarce any other *Idea* found, that can pretend to it: Since if God had ſet any Impreſſion, any Character on the Underſtanding of Men, it is moſt reaſonable to expect it ſhould have been ſome clear and uniform *Idea* of Himſelf, as far as our weak Capacities were capable to receive ſo incomprehenſible and infinite an Object. But our Minds being, at firſt, void of that *Idea*, which we are moſt concerned to have, it *is a ſtrong Preſumption againſt all other Innate Characters*. I muſt own, as far as I can obſerve, I can find none, and would be glad to be informed by any other.

*Idea of Subſtance not Innate.*

§. 18. I confeſs, there is another *Idea* which would be of general uſe for Mankind to have,

as it is of general talk, as if they had it; and that is the *Idea of Substance*, which we neither have, nor can have, by *Senſation* or *Reflection*. If Nature took care to provide us any *Ideas*, we might well expect it ſhould be ſuch, as by our own Faculties we cannot procure to our ſelves: But we ſee on the contrary, that ſince by thoſe ways, whereby other *Ideas* are brought into our Minds, this is not, we have no ſuch *clear Idea* at all, and therefore ſignify nothing by the Word *Subſtance*, but only an uncertain ſuppoſition of we know not what (*i. e.* of ſome thing whereof we have no particular diſtinct poſitive) *Idea*, which we take to be the *ſubſtratum*, or ſupport, of thoſe *Ideas*, we do know.

§. 19. Whatever then we talk of Innate, either *ſpeculative*, or *practical Principles*, it may, with as much probability, be ſaid, that a Man hath 100 *l.* ſterling in his Pocket, and yet denied, that he hath either Penny, Shilling, Crown, or any other Coin, out of which the Sum is to be made up; as to think, that certain Propoſitions are Innate, when the *Ideas* about which they are, can by no means be ſuppoſed to be ſo. The general reception and aſſent that is given, doth *not* at all prove, that the *Ideas* expreſſed in them, are *Innate*: For in many caſes, however the *Ideas* came there, the aſſent to Words expreſſing the agreement, or diſagreement, of ſuch *Ideas*, will neceſſarily follow. Every one that hath a true *Idea* of *God*, and *Worſhip*, will aſſent to this Propoſition, that God is to be worſhiped, when expreſſed, in a Language he underſtands: And every rational Man, that hath not thought on it to Day, may be ready to aſſent to this Propoſition to morrow; and yet millions of Men may be well ſuppoſed to want one, or both, thoſe *Ideas* to day. For if we will allow Savages, and moſt Country-people, to have *Ideas* of *God* and *Worſhip* (which converſation with them, will not make one forward to believe) yet I think, few Children can be ſuppoſed, to have thoſe *Ideas* which therefore they muſt begin to have ſometime or other; and then they will alſo begin to aſſent to that Propoſition, and make very little queſtion of it ever after. But ſuch an Aſſent upon hearing, no more proves the *Ideas* to be Innate, than it does, That one Born Blind (with Cataracts, which will be Couched to Morrow) had the Innate *Ideas* of the Sun, or Light, or Saffron, or Yellow; becauſe when his Sight is cleared, he will certainly Aſſent to this Propoſition, That the Sun is Lucid, or that Saffron is Yellow: And therefore if ſuch an Aſſent upon hearing, cannot

*No Propoſitions can be Innate, ſince no* Ideas *are Innate.*

prove

prove the *Ideas* Innate, it can much less the Propositions made up of those *Ideas*. If they have any Innate *Ideas*, I would be glad to be told, what, and how many they are.

*No Innate Ideas in the Memory.*

§. 20. To which let me add: If there be any Innate *Ideas*, any *Ideas* in the Mind, which the Mind does not actually think on; they must be lodg'd in the Memory, and from thence must be brought into view by Remembrance; *i. e.* must be known, when they are remembred, to have been Perceptions in the Mind before, unless Remembrance can be without Remembrance. For to Remember, is to perceive any thing with Memory, or with a Consciousness, that it was known or perceived before: Without this, whatever *Idea* comes into the Mind is New, and not remembred: This Consciousness of its having been in the Mind before, being that, which distinguishes Remembring from all other ways of Thinking. Whatever *Idea* was never perceived by the Mind, was never in the Mind. Whatever *Idea* is in the Mind, is either an actual perception, or else having been an actual perception, is so in the Mind, that by the Memory it can be made an actual perception again. Whenever there is the actual perception of an *Idea* without Memory, the *Idea* appears perfectly new and unknown before to the Understanding. Whenever the Memory brings any *Idea* into actual View, it is with a Consciousness, that it had been there before, and was not wholly a Stranger to the Mind. Whether this be not so, I appeal to every one's Observation: And then I desire an Instance of an *Idea*, pretended to be Innate, which (before any impression of it by ways hereafter to be mentioned) any one could revive and remember as an *Idea*, he had formerly known; without which Consciousness of a former perception, there is no remembrance; and whatever *Idea* comes into the Mind without that Consciousness, is not remembred, or comes not out of the Memory, nor can be said to be in the Mind before that appearance. For what is not either actually in View, or in the Memory, is in the Mind no way at all, and is all one as if it never had been there. Suppose a Child had the use of his Eyes till he knows and distinguishes Colours; but then Cataracts shut the Windows, and he is Forty or Fifty Years perfectly in the Dark; and in that time perfectly loses all Memory of the *Ideas* of Colours, he once had. This was the Case of a Blind Man I once talked with, who lost his Sight by the Small Pox, when he was a Child, and had no more notion of Colours, than one Born Blind. I ask whether any one can say

this

this Man had then any *Ideas* of Colours in his Mind, any more than one Born Blind? And I think no Body will say, that either of them had in his Mind any *Idea* of Colours at all. His Cataracts are couch'd, and then he has the *Ideas* (which he remembers not) of Colours, *de novo*, by his restor'd Sight, convey'd to his Mind, and that without any Consciousness of a former acquaintance. And these now he can revive, and call to mind in the Dark. In this Case all these *Ideas* of Colours, which when out of view can be reviv'd with a consciousness of a former acquaintance, being thus in the Memory, are said to be in the Mind. The use I make of this is, that whatever *Idea* being not actually in View, is in the Mind, is there only by being in the Memory; and if it be not in the Memory, it is not in the Mind; and if it be in the Memory, it cannot by the Memory be brought into actual View, without a Perception that it comes out of the Memory, which is this, that it had been known before, and is now remembred. If therefore there be any Innate *Ideas*, they must be in the Memory, or else no where in the Mind; and if they be in the Memory, they can be reviv'd without any Impression from without, and whenever they are brought into the Mind, they are remembred, *i. e.* they bring with them a perception of their not being wholly new to it. This being a constant, and distinguishing difference between what is, and what is not in the Memory, or in the Mind; that what is not in the Memory, whenever it appears there, appears perfectly new, and unknown before; and what is in the Memory, or in the Mind, whenever it is suggested by the Memory, appears not to be new, but the Mind finds it in its self, and knows it was there before. By this it may be tried, whether there be any Innate *Ideas* in the Mind, before impression from *Sensation* or *Reflection*. I would fain meet with the Man, who when he came to the use of Reason, or at any other time, remembred any of them: And to whom, after he was Born, they were never new. If any one will say, there are *Ideas* in the Mind, that are not in the Memory; I desire him to explain himself, and make what he says Intelligible.

*Principles not Innate, because of little use, or little certainty.*

§. 21. Besides what I have already said, there is another Reason, why I doubt, that neither these, nor any other Principles are Innate. I that am fully perswaded, that the infinitely Wise GOD made all Things in perfect Wisdom, cannot satisfy my self, why he should be supposed to print upon the Minds of Men, some Universal *Princi-*

*ples*;

*ples*; whereof those *that* are pretended Innate, and *concern Speculation, are of no great use; and those that concern Practice, not self-evident; and neither of them distinguishable from some other Truths, not allowed to be Innate.* For to what purpose should Characters be graven on the Mind, by the Finger of God, which are not clearer there, than those, which are afterwards introduced, or cannot be distinguish'd from them? If any one thinks there are such Innate *Ideas* and Propositions, which by their clearness and usefulness, are distinguishable from all that is adventitious in the Mind, and acquired, it will not be a hard matter for him to tell us, which they are; and then every one will be a fit Judge, whether they be so, or no. Since if there be such Innate *Ideas* and Impressions, plainly different from all other Perceptions and Knowledge, every one will find it true in himself. Of the Evidence of these supposed Innate Maxims, I have spoken already; of their Usefulness, I shall have occasion to speak more hereafter.

*Difference of Men's Discoveries depends upon the different application of their Faculties.*

§. 22. To conclude, Some *Ideas* forwardly offer themselves to all Men's Understandings; some sorts of Truths result from any *Ideas*, as soon as the Mind puts them into Propositions: Other Truths require a train of *Ideas* placed in order, a due comparing of them, and deductions made with attention, before they can be discovered, and assented to. Some of the first sort, because of their general and easy reception, have been mistaken for Innate: But the truth is, *Ideas* and Notions are no more Born with us, than Arts and Sciences; though some of them, indeed, offer themselves to our Faculties, more readily than others; and therefore are more generally received; Though that too, be according as the Organs of our Bodies, and Powers of our Minds, happen to be employ'd; *God having fitted Men with Faculties and Means, to discover, receive, and retain Truths, accordingly as they are employ'd.* The great difference that is to be found in the Notions of Mankind, is, from the different use they put their Faculties to, whilst some (and those the most) taking things upon trust, misimploy their Power of Assent, by lazily enslaving their Minds, to the Dictates and Dominion of others, in Doctrines, which it is their Duty carefully to examine; and not blindly, with an implicit Faith, to swallow: Others employing their Thoughts only about some few things, grow acquainted sufficiently with them, attain great degrees of Knowledge in them, and are ignorant of all other, having never let their Thoughts loose, in the search

of

of other Enquiries. Thus, that the three Angles of a Triangle are equal to two Right Ones, is a Truth, as certain as any thing can be; and I think more evident, than many of those Propositions, that go for Principles; and yet there are Millions, however expert in other things, who know not this at all, because they never set their Thoughts on work about such Angles: And he that certainly knows this Propopsition, may yet be utterly ignorant of the Truth of other Propositions, in Mathematicks it self, which are as clear and evident as this; because, in his search of those Mathematical Truths, he stopp'd his Thoughts short, and went not so far. The same may happen concerning the Notions we have of the Being of a Deity; for though there be no Truth, which a Man may more evidently make out to himself, than the Existence of a God, yet he that shall content himself with things, as he finds them, in this World, as they minister to his Pleasures and Passions, and not make enquiry a little farther into their Causes, Ends, and admirable Contrivances, and pursue the thoughts thereof with diligence and attention, may live long without any Notion of such a Being; And if any Person hath, by talk, put such a Notion into his Head, he may, perhaps, believe it: But if he hath never *examined* it, his knowledge of it will be no perfecter, than his, who having been told, that the three Angles of a Triangle are equal to two Right Ones, takes it upon trust, without examining the demonstration; and may yield his Assent as a probable Opinion, but hath no knowledge of the truth of it; which yet his Faculties, if carefully employ'd, were able to make clear and evident to him. But this only by the by, to shew how much our *knowledge depends upon the right use of those Powers Nature hath bestowed upon us*, and how little upon such Innate Principles, as are in vain supposed to be in all Mankind for their direction; which all Men could but not know, if they were there, or else they would be there to no purpose: And which, since all Men do not know, nor can distinguish from other adventitious Truths, we may well conclude there are no such.

*Men must think and know for themselves.*

§. 23. What Censure, doubting thus of Innate Principles, may deserve from Men, who will be apt to call it, pulling up the old Foundations of Knowledge and Certainty, I cannot tell: I perswade my self, at least, that the way I have pursued, being conformable to Truth, lays those Foundations surer. This I am certain, I have not made it my business, either to quit or follow any Authority in the ensuing Discourse: Truth

has

has been my only aim; and where-ever that has appeared to lead, my Thoughts have impartially followed, without minding, whether the Footsteps of any other lay that way, or no. Not that I want a due respect to other Mens Opinions; but after all, the *greatest Reverence is due to Truth*; and I hope, it will not be thought Arrogance to say, That perhaps, we should make greater progress in the Discovery of rational and contemplative *Knowledge*, if we *sought* it in the Fountain, *in the consideration of things themselves*; and made use rather of our own Thoughts, than other Mens to find it. For, I think, we may as rationally hope to see with other Mens Eyes, as to know by other Mens Understandings. So much as we our selves consider and comprehend of Truth and Reason, so much we possess of real and true Knowledge. The floating of other Mens Opinions in our Brains, makes us not one jot the more knowing, though they happen to be true. What in them was Science, is in us but Opiniatrety, whilst we give up our Assent only to reverend Names, and do not, as they did, employ our own Reason to *understand* those *Truths*, which gave them Reputation. *Aristotle* was certainly a knowing Man, but no Body ever thought him so, because he blindly embraced, and confidently vented the Opinions of another. And if the taking up of another's Principles, without examining them, made not him a Philosopher, I suppose it will hardly make any Body else so. In the Sciences, every one has so much, as he really knows and comprehends: What he believes only, and takes upon trust, are but shreads; which however well in the whole piece, make no considerable addition to his stock, who gathers them. Such borrowed Wealth, like Fairy-money, though it were Gold in the Hand from which he received it, will be but Leaves and Dust when it comes to use.

*Whence the Opinion of Innate Principles.*

§. 24. When Men have found some general Propositions that could not be doubted of, as soon as understood, it was, I know, *a short and easy way to conclude them Innate.* This being once received, it eased the Lazy from the pains of search; and stopp'd the enquiry of the Doubtful, concerning all that was once stiled Innate: And it was of no small advantage to those who affected to be Masters and Teachers, to make this the Principle of *Principles*, That Principles must not be questioned: For having once established this Tenet, That there are Innate Principles, it put their Followers upon a necessity of receiving some Doctrines as such; which was to take them off from the use of their own Reason and Judgment, and put

them upon believing and taking them upon trust, without farther examination: In which posture of blind Credulity, they might be more easily governed by, and made useful to some sort of Men, who had the Skill and Office to principle and guide them. Nor is it a small Power it gives one Man over another, to have the Authority to be the Dictator of Principles, and Teacher of unquestionable Truths; and to make a Man swallow that for an Innate Principle, which may serve to his purpose, who teacheth them. Whereas had they examined the ways, whereby Men came to the knowledge of many universal *Truths*, they would have found them to result in the Minds of Men, from the being of things themselves, when duly considered; and that they were discovered by the application of those Faculties, that were fitted by Nature to receive and judge of them, when duly employ'd about them.

*Conclusion.*

§. 25. *To shew how the Understanding proceeds herein, is the design of the following Discourse*; which I shall proceed to, when I have first premised, that hitherto to clear my way to those Foundations, which, I conceive are the only true ones, whereon to establish those Notions we can have of our own Knowledge, it hath been necessary for me to give an account of the Reasons, I had to doubt of Innate Principles: And since the Arguments which are against them, do some of them, rise from common received Opinions, I have been forced to take several things for granted, which is hardly avoidable to any one, whose Task it is to shew the falsehood, or improbability, of any Tenet; it happening in Controversial Discourses, as it does in assaulting of Towns; where, if the ground be but firm, whereon the Batteries are erected, there is no farther enquiry of whom it is borrowed, nor whom it belongs to, so it affords but a fit rise for the present purpose. But in the future part of this Discourse, designing to raise an Edifice uniform, and consistent with it self, as far as my own Experience and Observation will assist me, I hope, to erect it on such a Basis, that I shall not need to shore it up with Props and Buttresses, leaning on borrowed or begg'd Foundations: Or at least, if mine prove a Castle in the Air, I will endeavour it shall be all of a Piece, and hang together. Wherein I warn the Reader not to expect undeniable cogent Demonstrations, unless I may be allow'd the Priviledge, not seldom assumed by others, to take my Principles for granted; and then, I doubt not, but I can demonstrate too. All that I shall say for the Principles I proceed on, is, that I can only *appeal* to Mens own unprejudiced

ced *Experience*, and Observation, whether they be true, or no; and this is enough for a Man who professes no more, than to lay down candidly and freely his own Conjectures, concerning a Subject lying somewhat in the dark, without any other design, than an unbiass'd Enquiry after Truth.

# BOOK II.

## CHAP. I.

## *Of* Ideas *in General, and their Original.*

§. 1. EVery Man being conscious to himself, That he thinks, and that which his Mind is apply'd about, whilst thinking, being the *Ideas*, that are there; 'tis past doubt, that Men have in their Mind several *Ideas*, such as are those expressed by the Words, *Whiteness*, *Hardness*, *Sweetness*, *Thinking*, *Motion*, *Man*, *Elephant*, *Army*, *Drunkenness*, and others: It is in the first place then to be enquired, How he comes by them? I know it is a received Doctrine, That Men have native *Ideas*, and original Characters stamped upon their Minds, in their very first Being. This Opinion I have at large examined already; and, I suppose, what I have said in the foregoing Book, will be much more easily admitted, when I have shewn, whence the Understanding may get all the *Ideas* it has, and by what ways and degrees they may come into the Mind; for which I shall appeal to every one's own Observation and Experience.

Idea *is the Object of Thinking.*

§. 2. Let us then suppose the Mind to be, as we say, White-Paper, void of all Characters, without any *Ideas*; How comes it to be furnished? Whence comes it by that vast store, which the busy and boundless Fancy of Man has painted on it, with an almost endless variety? Whence has it all the materials of Reason and Knowledge? To this I answer, in one Word, From *Experience*: In that all our Knowledge is founded;

*All* Ideas *come from Sensation or Reflection.*

and from that it ultimately derives it self. Our Observation employ'd either about *External sensible Objects*; *or about the Internal Operations of our Minds, perceived and reflected on by our selves, is that, which supplies our Understandings with all the materials of Thinking.* These Two are the Fountains of Knowledge, from whence all the *Ideas* we have, or can naturally have, do spring.

*The Objects of Sensation one Source of Ideas.*

§. 3. First, *Our Senses*, conversant about particular sensible Objects, do *convey into the Mind*, several distinct *Perceptions* of things, according to those various ways, wherein those Objects do affect them: And thus we come by those *Ideas*, we have of *Yellow*, *White*, *Heat*, *Cold*, *Soft*, *Hard*, *Bitter*, *Sweet*, and all those which we call sensible Qualities, which when I say the Senses convey into the Mind, I mean, they from External Objects convey into the Mind what produces there those *Perceptions*. This great Source, of most of the *Ideas* we have, depending wholly upon our Senses, and derived by them to the Understanding, I call *SENSATION*.

*The Operations of our Minds, the other Source of them.*

§. 4. Secondly, The other Fountain, from which Experience furnisheth the Understanding with *Ideas*, is the *Perception of the Operations of our own Minds* within us, as it is employ'd about the *Ideas* it has got; which Operations, when the Soul comes to reflect on, and consider, do furnish the Understanding with another Set of *Ideas*, which could not be had from things without; and such are, *Perception*, *Thinking*, *Doubting*, *Believing*, *Reasoning*, *Knowing*, *Willing*, and all the different actings of our own Minds; which we being conscious of, and observing in our selves, do from these receive into our Understandings, as distinct *Ideas*, as we do from Bodies affecting our Senses. This Source of *Ideas*, every Man was wholly in himself: And though it be not Sense, as having nothing to do with External Objects; yet it is very like it, and might properly enough be call'd Internal Sense. But as I call the other *Sensation*, so I call this *REFLECTION*, the *Ideas* it affords being such only, as the Mind gets by reflecting on its own Operations within it self. By *REFLECTION* then, in the following part of this Discourse, I would be understood to mean, that notice which the Mind takes of its own Operations, and the manner of them, by reason whereof, there come to be *Ideas* of these Operations in the Understanding. These two, I say, *viz.* External, Material things, as the Objects of *SENSATION*; And the Operations of our own Minds within, as

the

the Objects of *REFLECTION*, are, to me, the only Originals, from whence all our *Ideas* take their beginnings. The term *Operations* here, I use in a large sense, as comprehending not barely the Actions of the Mind about its *Ideas*, but some sort of Passions arising sometimes from them, such as is the satisfaction or uneasiness arising from any thought.

*All our* Ideas *are of the one or the other of these.*

§. 5. The Understanding seems to me, not to have the least glimmering of any *Ideas*, which it doth not receive from one of these two. *External Objects furnish the Mind with the* Ideas *of sensible qualities*, which are all those different Perceptions they produce in us: And the *Mind furnishes the Understanding with* Ideas *of its own Operations.*

These, when we have taken a full survey of them, and their several Modes, Combinations, and Relations, we shall find to contain all our whole stock of *Ideas*; and that we have nothing in our Minds, which did not come in, one of these two ways. Let any one examine his own Thoughts, and throughly search into his Understanding, and then let him tell me, Whether all the Original *Ideas* he has there, are any other than of the Objects of his *Senses*; or of the Operations of his Mind, considered as Objects of his *Reflection*: And how great a mass of Knowledge soever he imagines to be lodged there, he will, upon taking a strict view, see, that he has *not any* Idea *in his Mind, but what one of these two have imprinted*; though, perhaps, with infinite variety compounded and enlarged by the Understanding, as we shall see hereafter.

*Observable in Children.*

§. 6. He that attentively considers the state of a *Child*, at his first coming into the World, will have little reason to think him stored with plenty of *Ideas*, that are to be the matter of his future Knowledge. 'Tis by degrees he comes to be furnished with them: And though the *Ideas* of obvious and familiar Qualities, imprint themselves, before the Memory begins to keep a Register of Time and Order, yet 'tis often so late, before some unusual Qualities come in the way, that there are few Men that cannot recollect the beginning of their acquaintance with them: And if it were worth while, no doubt a Child might be so ordered, as to have but a very few, even of the ordinary *Ideas*, till he were grown up to a Man. But all that are Born into the World being surrounded with Bodies, that perpetually and diversly affect them, variety of *Ideas*, whether care be taken about it or no, are imprinted on the Minds of Children. *Light*, and *Colours*, are busy at hand every-where, when the Eye is but open; *Sounds*, and

some *tangible Qualities* fail not to solicite their proper Senses, and force an entrance to the Mind; but yet, I think, it will be granted easily, That if a Child were kept in a place, where he never saw any other but Black and White, till he were a Man, he would have no more *Ideas* of Scarlet or Green, than he that from his Child-hood never tasted an Oyster, or a Pine-Apple, has of those particular Relishes.

*Men are differently furnished with these, according to the different Objects they converse with.*

§. 7. Men then come to be furnished with fewer or more simple *Ideas* from without, according as the *Objects*, they converse with, afford greater or less variety; and from the Operation of their Minds within, according as they more or less *reflect* on them. For, though he that contemplates the Operations of his Mind, cannot but have plain and clear *Ideas* of them; yet unless he turn his Thoughts that way, and considers them *attentively*, he will no more have clear and distinct *Ideas* of all the *Operations of his Mind*, and all that may be observed therein, than he will have all the particular *Ideas* of any Landscape, or of the Parts and Motions of a Clock, who will not turn his Eyes to it, and with attention heed all the Parts of it. The Picture, or Clock may be so placed, that they may come in his way every day; but yet he will have but a confused *Idea* of all the Parts they are made up of, till he *applies himself with attention*, to consider them each in particular.

Ideas *of Reflection later, because they need Attention.*

§. 8. And hence we see the Reason, why 'tis pretty late, before most Children get *Ideas* of the Operations of their own Minds; and some have not any very clear, or perfect *Ideas* of the greatest part of them all their Lives. Because, though they pass there continually; yet like floating Visions they make not deep impressions enough, to leave in the Mind clear distinct lasting *Ideas*, till the Understanding turns inwards upon it self, *reflects* on its own *Operations*, and makes them the Object of its own Contemplation. Children, when they come first into it, are surrounded with a world of new things, which, by a constant solicitation of their Senses, draw the Mind constantly to them, forward to take notice of new, and apt to be delighted with the variety of changing Objects. Thus the first Years are usually employ'd and diverted in looking abroad. Mens business in them is to acquaint themselves with what is to be found without; and so growing up in a constant attention to outward Sensations, seldom make any considerable Reflection on what passes within them, till

they

they come to be of riper Years; and some scarce even at all.

§. 9. To ask, *at what time a Man has first any Ideas*, is to ask, when he begins to perceive; having *Ideas*, and Perception, being the same thing. I know it is an Opinion, that the Soul always thinks, and that it has the actual Perception of *Ideas* in it self constantly, as long as it exists; and that actual Thinking is as inseparable from the Soul, as actual Extension is from the Body; which if true, to enquire after the beginning of a Man's *Ideas*, is the same, as to enquire after the beginning of his Soul. For by this Account, Soul and its *Ideas*, as Body and its Extension, will begin to exist both at the same time.

*The Soul begins to have Ideas, when it begins to perceive.*

§. 10. But whether the Soul be supposed to exist antecedent to, or coeval with, or some time after the first Rudiments or Organisation, or the beginnings of Life in the Body, I leave to be disputed by those, who have better thought of that Matter. I confess my self, to have one of those dull Souls, that doth not perceive it self always to contemplate *Ideas*, nor can conceive it any more necessary for the *Soul always to think*, than for the Body always to move; the Perception of *Ideas* being (as I conceive) to the Soul, what motion is to the Body, not its Essence, but one of its Operations: And therefore, though Thinking be supposed never so much the proper Action of the Soul; yet it is not necessary, to suppose, that it should be always Thinking, always in Action. That, perhaps, is the Privilege of the infinite Author and Preserver of things, *who never slumbers nor sleeps*; but is not competent to any finite Being, at least not to the Soul of Man. We know certainly by Experience, that we sometimes think, and thence draw this infallible Consequence, That, there is something in us, that has a Power to think: But whether that Substance perpetually thinks, or no, we can be no farther assured, than Experience informs us. For to say, that actual thinking is essential to the Soul, and inseparable from it, is to beg, what is in Question, and not to prove it by Reason; which is necessary to be done, if it be not a self-evident Proposition. But whether this, *That the Soul always thinks*, be a self-evident Proposition, that every Body assents to at first hearing, I appeal to Mankind. 'Tis doubted whether I thought all last Night, or no; the Question being about a matter of Fact, 'tis begging it, to bring as a proof for it, an Hypothesis, which is the very thing in dispute; by which way

*The Soul thinks not always; for this wants Proofs.*

one may prove any thing, and 'tis but supposing that all Watches, whilst the Balance beats, think, and 'tis sufficiently proved, and past doubt, that my Watch thought all last Night. But he, that would not deceive himself, ought to build his Hypothesis on matter of Fact, and make it out by sensible Experience, and not presume on matter of Fact, because of his Hypothesis, that is, because he supposes it to be so; which way of proving, amounts to this, That I must necessarily think all last Night, because another supposes I always think, though I my self cannot perceive, that I always do so.

But Men in love with their Opinions, may not only suppose what is in question, but alledge wrong matter of Fact. How else could any one make it an *Inference* of mine, *that a thing is not, because we are not sensible of it in our sleep?* I do not say there is no Soul in a Man, because he is not sensible of it in his sleep: But I do say, he cannot think at any time waking or sleeping, without being sensible of it. Our being sensible of it, is not necessary to any thing, but to our Thoughts; and to them it is, and to them it will always be necessary, till we can think without being conscious of it.

*It is not always conscious of it.*

§. 11. I grant that the Soul in a waking Man, is never without Thought, because it is the condition of being awake: But whether sleeping without dreaming be not an Affection of the whole Man, Mind as well as Body, may be worth a waking Man's Consideration; it being hard to conceive, that any thing should think, and not be conscious of it. If the *Soul* doth *think in a sleeping Man*, without being conscious of it, I ask, whether, during such thinking, it has any Pleasure or Pain, or be capable of Happiness or Misery? I am sure the Man is not, no more than the Bed or Earth he lies on. For to be Happy or Miserable, without being conscious of it, seems to me utterly inconsistent and impossible. Or if it be possible, that the Soul can, whilst the Body is sleeping, have its Thinking, Enjoyments, and Concerns, its Pleasure or Pain apart, which the Man is not conscious of, nor partakes in: It is certain, that *Socrates* a sleep, and *Socrates* awake, is not the same Person: but his Soul when he sleeps, and *Socrates* the Man, consisting of Body and Soul when he is waking, are two Persons; Since waking *Socrates*, has no Knowledge of, or Concernment for that Happiness, or Misery of his Soul, which it enjoys alone by it self whilst he sleeps, without perceiving any thing of it: no more than he has for the Happiness, or Misery of a Man in the

*Indies,*

*Indies*, whom he knows not. For if we take wholly away all Conſciouſneſs of our Actions and Senſations, eſpecially of Pleaſure and Pain, and the concernment that accompanies it, it will be hard to know wherein to place perſonal Identity.

§. 12. The Soul, during ſound Sleep, thinks, ſays theſe Men. *Whilſt it thinks* and perceives, it is capable certainly of thoſe of Delight or Trouble, as well as any other Perceptions; and *it muſt neceſſarily be conſcious of its own Perceptions.* But it has all this apart: The ſleeping Man, 'tis plain, is conſcious of nothing of all this. Let us ſuppoſe then the Soul of *Caſtor*, whilſt he is ſleeping, retired from his Body, which is no impoſſible Suppoſition for the Man I have here to do with, who ſo liberally allow Life, without a thinking Soul to all other Animals. Theſe Men cannot then judge it impoſſible, or a contradiction, That the Body ſhould live without the Soul; nor that the Soul ſhould ſubſiſt and think, or have Perception, even Perception of Happineſs or Miſery, without the Body. Let us then, as I ſay, ſuppoſe the Soul of *Caſtor* ſeparated, during his Sleep, from his Body, to think apart. Let us ſuppoſe too, that it chuſes for its Scene of Thinking, the Body of another Man, *v. g. Pollux*, who is ſleeping without a Soul: For if *Caſtor*'s Soul can think whilſt *Caſtor* is aſleep, what *Caſtor* is never conſcious of, 'tis no matter what Place it chuſes to think in. We have here then, the Bodies of two Men with only one Soul between them, which we will ſuppoſe to ſleep and wake by turns; and the Soul ſtill thinking in the waking Man, whereof the ſleeping Man is never conſcious, has never the leaſt Perception. I ask then, Whether *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, thus, with only one Soul between them, which thinks and perceives in one, what the other is never conſcious of, nor is concerned for, are not two as diſtinct Perſons, as *Caſtor* and *Hercules*; or, as *Socrates* and *Plato* were? And whether one of them might not be very happy, and the other very miſerable? Juſt by the ſame Reaſon, they make the Soul and the Man two Perſons, who make the Soul think apart, what the Man it not conſcious of. For I ſuppoſe, no body will make Identity of Perſons, to conſiſt in the Soul's being united to the very ſame numerical Particles of matter: For if that be neceſſary to Identity, 'twill be impoſſible, in that conſtant flux of the Particles of our Bodies, that any Man ſhould be the ſame Perſon, two Days, or two Moments together.

*If a ſleeping Man thinks without knowing it, the ſleeping and waking Man are two Perſons.*

§. 13.

*Impossible to convince those that sleep without dreaming, that they think.*

§. 13. Thus, methinks, every drowsy Nod shakes their Doctrine, who teach, That the Soul is always thinking. Those, at least, who do at any time *sleep without dreaming*, can never be convinced, That their Thoughts are sometimes for four Hours busy without their knowing of it; and if they are taken in the very act, waked in the middle of that sleeping Contemplation, can give no manner of account of it.

*That Men dream without remembring it, in vain urged.*

§. 14. 'Twill perhaps be said, That the *Soul thinks*, even *in* the soundest *Sleep*, *but the Memory retains it not.* That the Soul in a sleeping Man should be this moment busy a thinking, and the next moment in a waking Man, not remember, nor be able to recollect one jot of all those Thoughts, is very hard to be conceived, and would need some better Proof than bare Assertion, to make it be believed. For who can without any more ado, but being barely told so, imagine, That the greatest part of Men, do, during all their Lives, for several Hours every Day, think of something, which if they were asked, even in the middle of these Thoughts, they could remember nothing at all of? Most Men, I think, pass a great part of their Sleep without Dreaming. I once knew a Man, that was bred a Scholar, and had no bad Memory, who told me, he had never Dream'd in his Life, till he had that Fever, he was then newly recovered of, which was about the Five or Six and Twentieth Year of his Age. I suppose the World affords more such Instances: At least every one's Acquaintance will furnish him with Examples enough of such, as pass most of their Nights without Dreaming.

*Upon this Hypothesis, the Thoughts of a sleeping Man ought to be most rational.*

§. 15. *To think often, and never to retain it so much as one moment, is a very useless sort of thinking*: And the Soul in such a state of thinking, does very little if at all, excel that of a Looking-glass, which constantly receives variety of Images, or *Ideas*, but retains none; they disappear and vanish, and there remain no foot-steps of them; the Looking-glass is never the better for such *Ideas*, nor the Soul for such Thoughts. Perhaps it will be said, that in a waking Man, the Materials of the Body are employ'd, and made use of, in thinking; and that the memory of Thoughts, is retained by the impressions that are made on the Brain, and the traces there left after such thinking; but that in the *thinking of the Soul*, which

is not perceived *in a sleeping Man*, there the Soul thinks apart, and *making no use* of the Organs of *the Body, leaves no impressions on it, and consequently no memory* of such Thoughts. Not to mention again the absurdity of two distinct Persons, which follows from this Supposition, I answer farther, That whatever *Ideas* the Mind can receive, and contemplate without the help of the Body, it is reasonable to conclude, it can retain without the help of the Body too, or else the Soul, or any separate Spirit will have but little advantage by Thinking. If it has no memory of its own Thoughts; if it cannot lay up them for its use, and be able to recal them upon occasion; if it cannot reflect upon what is past, and make use of its former Experiences, Reasonings, and Contemplations, to what purpose does it think? They, who make the Soul a thinking Thing, at this rate, will not make it a much more noble Being, than those do, whom they condemn, for allowing it to be nothing but the subtilest parts of Matter. Characters drawn on Dust, that the first breath of Wind effaces; or Impressions made on a heap of Atoms, or animal Spirits, are altogether as Useful, and render the Subject as Noble, as the Thoughts of a Soul that perish in Thinking; that once out of sight, are gone for ever, and leave no memory of themselves behind them. Nature never makes excellent Things, for mean or no Uses: And it is hardly to be conceived, that our infinitely wise Creator, should make so admirable a Faculty, as the power of Thinking, that Faculty which comes nearest the Excellency of his own incomprehensible Being, to be so idlely and uselessly employ'd, at least ¾ part of its time here, as to think constantly, without remembring any of those Thoughts, without doing any good to it self or others, or being any way useful to any other part of the Creation. If we will examine it, we shall not find, I suppose, the motion of dull and senseless Matter, any where in the Universe, made so little use of, and so wholly thrown away.

*On this Hypothesis the Soul must have Ideas not derived from Sensation or Reflection, of which there is no appearance.*

§. 16. 'Tis true, we have sometimes instances of Perception, whilst we are *asleep*, and retain the memory of those *Thoughts*: But how *extravagant* and incoherent for the most part they are; how little conformable to the Perfection and Order of a rational Being, those who are acquainted with Dreams, need not be told. This I would willingly be satisfied in, Whether the Soul, when it thinks thus apart, and as it were separate from the Body, acts less rationally than when conjointly with it, or no:

If

If its separate Thoughts be less rational, then these Men must say, That the Soul owes the perfection of rational Thinking to the Body: If it does not, 'tis a wonder that our Dreams should be, for the most part, so frivolous and irrational; and that the Soul should retain none of its more rational Soliloquies and Meditations.

*If I think when I know it not, no body else can know it.*

§. 17. Those who so confidently tell us, That the Soul always actually thinks, I would they would also tell us, what those *Ideas* are, that are in the Soul of a Child, before, or just at the union with the Body, before it hath received any by *Sensation*. The *Dreams* of sleeping Men, *are*, as I take it, all *made up of the waking Man's* Ideas, though, for the most part, oddly put together. 'Tis strange, if the Soul has *Ideas* of its own, that it derived not from *Sensation* or *Reflection*, (as it must have, if it thought before it received any impression from the Body) that it should never, in its private thinking, (so private, that the Man himself perceives it not) retain any of them, the very moment it wakes out of them, and then make the Man glad with new discoveries. Who can find it reasonable, that the Soul should, in its retirement, during sleep, have so many hours thoughts, and yet never light on any of those *Ideas* it borrowed not from *Sensation* or *Reflection*; or at least preserve the memory of none, but such, which being occasioned from the Body, must needs be less natural to a Spirit? 'Tis strange, the Soul should never once in a Man's whole Life, recal over any of its pure, native Thoughts, and those *Ideas* it had, before it borrowed any thing from the Body; never bring into the waking Man's view, any other *Ideas*, but what have a Tang of the Cask, and manifestly derive their Original from that union. If it always thinks, and so had *Ideas* before it was united, or before it received any from the Body, 'tis not to be supposed, but that during Sleep, it recollects its native *Ideas*, and during that retirement from communicating with the Body, whilst it thinks by it self, the *Ideas* it is busied about, should be, sometimes at least, those more natural and congenial ones which it had in it self, underived from the Body, or its own Operation about them: Which since the waking Man never remembers, we must from this Hypothesis conclude, either that the Soul remembers something that the Man does not; or else that Memory belongs only to such *Ideas*, as are derived from the Body, or the Minds Operations about them.

§. 18. I would be glad also to learn from these Men, who so

so confidently pronounce, that the humane Soul, or which is all one, that a Man always thinks, how they come to know it; nay, *how they come to know that they themselves think, when they themselves do not perceive it.* This I am afraid, is to be sure, without Proofs; and to know, without perceiving: 'Tis, I suspect, a confused Notion, taken up to serve an Hypothesis; and none of those clear Truths, that either their own Evidence forces us to admit, or common Experience makes it impudence to deny. For the most that can be said of it, is, That 'tis possible the Soul may always think, but not always retain it in memory: And I say, it is as possible, that the Soul may not always think; and much more probable, that it should sometimes not think, than that it should often think, and that a long while together, and not be conscious to it self the next moment after, that it had thought.

*How knows any one that the Soul always thinks? For if it be not a self-evident Proposition, it needs proof.*

§. 19. To suppose the Soul to think, and the Man to perceive it, is, as has been said, to make two Persons in one Man: And if one considers well these Men's way of speaking, one should be led into a suspicion, that they do so. For they who tell us, that the Soul always thinks, do never, that I remember, say, That a Man always thinks. Can the Soul think, and not the Man? Or a Man think, and not be conscious of it? This perhaps, would be suspected of *Jargon* in others. If they say, The Man thinks always, but is not always conscious of it; they may as well say, His Body is extended, without having parts. For 'tis altogether as intelligible to say, that a Body is extended without parts, as that any thing *thinks without being conscious of it*, or perceiving, that is does so. They who talk thus, may, with as much reason, if it be necessary to their Hypothesis, say, That a Man is always Hungry, but that he does not always feel it: Whereas Hunger consists in that very Sensation, as thinking consists in beings conscious that one thinks. If they say, That a Man is always conscious to himself of thinking; I ask, How they know it? Consciousness is the Perception of what passes in a Man's own Mind. Can another Man perceive, that I am conscious of any thing, when I perceive it not my self? No Man's Knowledge here, can go beyond his Experience. Wake a Man out of a sound Sleep, and ask him, What he was that moment thinking on? If he himself be conscious of nothing he then thought

*That a Man should be busy in thinking, and yet not retain it the next moment, very improbable.*

thought on, he must be a notable Diviner of Thoughts, that can assure him, that he was thinking: May he not with more reason assure him, he was not asleep? This is something beyond Philosophy; and it cannot be less than Revelation, that discovers to another, Thoughts in my Mind, when I can find none there my self: And they must needs have a penetrating sight, who can certainly see, that I think, when I cannot perceive it my self, and when I declare, that I do not; and yet can see, that Dogs or Elephants do not think, when they give all the demonstration of it imaginable, except only telling us, that they do so. This some may suspect to be a step beyond the *Rosecrucians*; it seeming easier to make ones self invisible to others, than to make another's thoughts visible to me, which are not visible to himself. But 'tis but defining the Soul to be a Substance, that always thinks, and the business is done. If such definition be of any Authority, I know not what it can serve for, but to make many Men suspect, That they have no Souls at all, since they find a good part of their Lives pass away without thinking. For no Definitions, that I know, no Suppositions of any Sect, are of force enough to destroy constant Experience; and perhaps, 'tis the affectation of knowing beyond what we perceive, that makes so much useless dispute, and noise, in the World.

*No Ideas but from Sensation or Reflection, evident, if we observe Children.*

§. 20. I see no Reason therefore to believe, that the *Soul thinks before the Senses have furnish'd it with Ideas* to think on; and as those are increased, and retained; so it comes, by Exercise, to improve its Faculty of thinking, in the several parts of it, as well as afterwards, by compounding those *Ideas*, and reflecting on its own Operations, it increases its Stock as well as Facility, in remembring, imagining, reasoning, and other modes of thinking.

§. 21. He that will suffer himself, to be informed by Observation and Experience, and not make his own Hypothesis the Rule of Nature, will find few Signs of a Soul accustomed to much thinking in a new-born Child, and much fewer of any Reasoning at all. And yet it is hard to imagine, that the rational Soul should think so much, and not reason at all. And he that will consider, that Infants, newly come into the World, spend the greatest part of their time in Sleep, and are seldom awake, but when either Hunger calls for the Teat, or some Pain, (the most importunate of all Sensations) or some other violent Impression on the Body, forces the Mind to perceive, and attend

tend to it. He, I say, who considers this, will, perhaps, find Reason to imagine, That a *Fœtus in the Mothers Womb, differs not much from the State of a Vegetable*; but passes the greatest part of of its time without Perception or Thought, doing very little, but sleep in a Place, where it needs not seek for Food, and is surrounded with Liquor, always equally soft, and near of the same Temper; where the Eyes have no Light, and the Ears, so shut up, are not very susceptible of Sounds; and where there is little or no variety, or change of Objects, to move the Senses.

§. 22. Follow a *Child* from its Birth, and observe the alterations that time makes, and you shall find, as the Mind by the Senses comes more and more to be furnished with *Ideas*, it comes to be more and more awake; thinks more, the more it has matter to think on. After some time, it begins to know the Objects, which being most familiar with it, have made lasting Impressions. Thus it comes, by degrees, to know the Persons it daily converses with, and distinguish them from Strangers; which are Instances and Effects of its coming to retain and distinguish the *Ideas* the Senses convey to it: And so we may observe, how the Mind, *by degrees*, improves in these, and *advances* to the Exercise of those other Faculties of *Enlarging*, *Compounding*, and *Abstracting* its *Ideas*, and of reasoning about them, and reflecting upon all these, of which, I shall have occasion to speak more hereafter.

§. 23. If it shall be demanded then, *When a Man begins to have any Ideas?* I think, the true Answer is, When he first has any *Sensation*. For since there appear not to be any *Ideas* in the Mind, before the Senses have conveyed any in, I conceive that *Ideas* in the Understanding, are coeval with *Sensation*: which is such an Impression or Motion, made in some part of the Body, as produces some Perception in the Understanding. 'Tis about these Impressions made on our Senses by outward Objects, that the Mind seems first to imploy it self in such Operations as we call *Perception*, *Remembring*, *Consideration*, *Reasoning*, &c.

*The Original of all our Knowledge.*

§. 24. In time, the Mind comes to reflect on its own *Operations*, about the *Ideas* got by *Sensation*, and thereby stores it self with a new Set of *Ideas*, which I call *Ideas* of *Reflection*. These are the *Impressions* that are made on our *Senses* by outward Objects, that are extrinsical to the Mind; and *its own Operations*, proceeding from Powers intrinsical and proper to it self, which when reflected on by it self, become also Objects of its con-

contemplation, are, as I have said, *The Original of all Knowledge*. Thus the first Capacity of Humane Intellect, is, that the Mind is fitted to receive the Impressions made on it; either, through the *Senses*, by outward Objects; or by its own Operations, when it *reflects* on them. This is the first step a Man makes towards the Discovery of any thing, and the Ground-work whereon to build all those Notions, which ever he shall have naturally in this World. All those sublime Thoughts, which towre above the Clouds, and reach as high as Heaven it self, take their Rise and Footing here: In all that great Extent wherein the Mind wanders, in those remote Speculations, it may seem to be elevated with, it stirs not one jot beyond those *Ideas*, which *Sense* or *Reflection* have offered for its Contemplation.

*In the reception of simple Ideas, the Understanding is for the most part passive.*

§. 25. In this Part, the *Understanding* is meerly *passive*; and whether or no, it will have these Beginnings, and as it were materials of Knowledge, is not in its own Power. For the Objects of our Senses, do, many of them, obtrude their particular *Ideas* upon our Minds, whether we will or no: And the Operations of our Minds, will not let us be without, at least some obscure Notions of them. No Man can be wholly ignorant of what he does, when he thinks. These *simple Ideas*, when offered to the Mind, *the Understanding can* no more refuse to have, nor alter, when they are imprinted, nor blot them out, and make new ones, it self, than a mirror can refuse, alter, or obliterate the Images or *Ideas*, which, the Objects set before it, do therein produce. As the Bodies that surround us, do diversly affect our Organs, the Mind is forced to receive the Impressions; and cannot avoid the Perception of those *Ideas* that are annexed to them.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of Simple* IDEAS.

*Uncompounded Appearances.*

§. 1. THE better to understand the Nature, Manner, and Extent of our Knowledge, one thing is carefully to be observed, concerning the *Ideas* we have; and that is, That *some* of them are *simple*, and *some complex*.

Though

Though the Qualities that affect our Senses, are, in the things themselves, so united and blended, that there is no separation, no distance between them; yet 'tis plain, the *Ideas* they produce in the Mind, enter by the Senses simple and unmixed. For though the Sight and Touch often take in from the same Object, at the same time, different *Ideas*; as a Man sees at once Motion and Colour; the Hand feel Softness and Warmth in the same piece of Wax: Yet the simple *Ideas* thus united in the same Subject, are as perfectly distinct, as those that come in by different Senses. The coldness and hardness, which a Man feels in a piece of *Ice*, being as distinct *Ideas* in the Mind, as the Smell and Whiteness of a Lily; or as the taste of Sugar, and smell of a Rose: And there is nothing can be plainer to a Man than the clear and distinct Perception he has of those simple *Ideas*; which being each in it self uncompounded, contains in it nothing but *one uniform Appearance*, or Conception in the Mind, and is not distinguishable into different *Ideas*.

*The Mind can neither make nor destroy them.*

§. 2. These simple *Ideas*, the Materials of all our Knowledge, are suggested and furnished to the Mind, only by those two ways above mentioned, *viz. Sensation* and *Reflection*. (1) When the Understanding is once stored with these simple *Ideas*, it has the Power to repeat, compare, and unite them, even to an almost infinite Variety, and so can make at Pleasure new complex *Ideas*. But it is not in the Power of the most

(1) Against this, that the Materials of all our Knowledge, are suggested and furnished to the Mind only by Sensation and Reflection, the Bishop of *Worcester* makes Use of the Idea of *Substance* in these Words: *If the Idea of Substance be grounded upon plain and evident Reason, then we must allow an Idea of Substance, which comes not in by Sensation, or Reflection, so we may be certain of something which we have not by those* Ideas.

To which our Author (*) answers: These Words of your Lordships contains nothing, that I see in them against me: For I never said, that *the general* Idea *of Substance comes in by* Sensation *and* Reflection; or that it is a simple *Idea* of Sensation or Reflection, tho' it be ultimately founded in them; for it is a complex *Idea*, made up of the general *Idea* of *something*, or *being* with the Relation of a support to Accidents. For general *Ideas* come not into the Mind by Sensation or Reflection, but are the Creatures or Inventions of the Understanding, as, I think, I have shewn; and also, how the Mind makes them from *Ideas*, which it has got by Sensation and Reflection; and has to the *Ideas* of Relation,

(*) *In his first Letter to the Bishop of* Worcester, p. 35. &c.

*B. 3. c. 3. B. 2. c. 25. &c. c. 28. §. 18.*

most exalted Wit, or enlarged Understanding, by any quickness or variety of Thoughts, to *invent or frame one new simple* Idea in the Mind, not taken in by the ways before mentioned: Nor can any force of the Understanding, *destroy* those that are there. The Dominion of Man, in this little World of his own Understanding, being much what the same, as it is in the great World of visible things; wherein his Power, however managed by Art and Skill, reaches no farther, than to compound and divide the Materials, that are made to his Hand; but can do nothing towards the making the least Particle of new Matter, or destroying one Atome of what is already in Being. The same Inability, will every one find in himself, who shall go about to fashion in his Understanding any simple *Idea*, not received in by his Senses, from external Objects; or by reflection from the Operations of his own Mind about them. I would have any one try to fancy any Taste, which had never affected his Palate; or frame the *Idea* of a Scent, he had never smelt: And when he can do this, I will also conclude, that a blind Man hath *Ideas* of Colours, and a deaf Man true distinct Notions of Sounds.

§. 3.

---

how the Mind forms them, and how they are derived from, and ultimately terminate in *Ideas* of Sensation and Reflection, I have likewise shewn.

But that I may not be mistaken what I mean, when I speak of *Ideas* of Sensation and Reflection, as the Materials of all our Knowledge; give me leave, my Lord, to set down here a place or two, out of
*B.* 2. *c.* 1. §. 5. my Book, to explain my self; as I thus speak of *Ideas* of Sensation and Reflection.

'That these, when we have taken a full Survey of them, and their several Modes, and the Compositions made out of them, we shall find to 'contain all our whole Stock of *Ideas*, and we have nothing in our Minds, 'which did not come in one of these two Ways. This
*B.* 2 *c.* 7. §. 10. 'thought in another place, I express thus:

'These are the most considerable of those simple *Ideas* 'which the Mind has, and out of which is made all its o-
*B.* 2. *c.* 21. 'ther Knowledge; all which it receives by the two fore-
§. 73. 'mentioned ways of Sensation and Reflection. And,

'Thus I have in a short Draught, given a View of our 'Original *Ideas*, from whence all the rest are derived, and of which they 'are made up.

This, and the like, said in other places, is what I have thought concerning *Ideas* of Sensation and Reflection, as the Foundation and Materials of all our *Ideas*, and consequently of all our Knowledge: I have set down these Particulars out of my Book, that the Reader having a full View of my Opinion herein, may the better see what in it is liable to your Lordships Reprehension.

§. 3. This is the Reason why, though we cannot believe it impossible to God, to make a Creature with other Organs, and more ways to convey into the Understanding the notice of Corporeal things than those five, as they are usually counted, which he has given to Man: Yet I think, it is *not possible*, for any one *to imagine* any other *Qualities* in Bodies, howsoever constituted, whereby they can be taken notice of, besides Sounds, Tastes, Smells, visible and tangible Qualities. And had Mankind been made with but four Senses, the Qualities then, which are the Object of the Fifth Sense, had been as far from our Notice, Imagination, and Conception, as now any *belonging to a sixth, seventh, or eighth Sense*, can possibly be: Which, whether yet some other Creatures, in some other Parts of this vast, and stupendious Universe, may not have, will be a great Presumption to

---

prehension. For that your Lordship is not very well satisfied with it, appears not only by the Words under Consideration, but by these also. *But we are still told, that our Understanding can have no other* Ideas, *but either from Sensation or Reflection.*

Your Lordships Argument, in the Passage we are upon, stands thus: *If the general* Idea *of Substance be grounded upon plain and evident Reason, then we must allow an* Idea *of Substance, which comes not in by Sensation or Reflection.* This is a consequence which, with Submission, I think will not hold, because it is founded upon a Supposition, which I think will not hold, *viz.* That Reason and Ideas are inconsistent; for if that Supposition be not true, then the general *Idea* of Substance, may be grounded on plain and evident Reason; and yet it will not follow from thence, that it is not ultimately grounded on and derived from Ideas, *which come in by Sensation or Reflection*, and so cannot be said to come in by Sensation or Reflection.

To explain my self, and clear my meaning in this matter. All the *Ideas* of all the sensible Qualities of a Cherry, come into my Mind by Sensation; the *Ideas* of *Perceiving, Thinking, Reasoning, Knowing*, &c. come into my Mind by Reflection. The *Ideas* of these Qualities and Actions, or Powers, are perceived by the Mind, to be by themselves inconsistent with existence; or, as your Lordship well expresses it, *we find that we can have no true Conception of any Modes or Accidents, but we must conceive a* Substratum *or Subject, wherein they are*, i. e. That they cannot Exist or Subsist of themselves. Hence the Mind perceives their necessary Connection with inherence or being supported, which being a relative *Idea*, superadded to the *Red Colour* in a Cherry, or to thinking in a Man, the Mind frames the correlative *Idea* of a *Support*. For I never denied, that the Mind could frame to it self *Ideas* of relation, but have shewed the quite contrary in my Chapters about *Relation*. But because a Relation cannot be founded in nothing, or be the Relation of nothing, and the thing here related as a *Supporter*, or a *Support*, is not represented to the Mind, by any clear and di-

to deny. He that will not set himself proudly at the top of all things; but will consider the Immensity of this Fabrick, and the great variety, that is to be found in this little and inconsiderable part of it, which he has to do with, may be apt to think, that in other Mansions of it, there may be other, and different intelligent Beings, of whose Faculties, he has as little Knowledge or Apprehension, as a Worm shut up in one Drawer of a Cabinet, hath of the Senses or Understanding of a Man; Such Variety and Excellency, being suitable to the Wisdom and Power of the Maker. I have here followed the common Opinion of Man's having but five Senses; though, perhaps, there may be justly counted more; but either Supposition serves equally to my present purpose.

---

stinct *Idea*, therefore the obscure, indistinct, vague *Idea* of *thing*, or *something* is all that is left to be the positive *Idea*, which has the relation of a *Support* or *Substratum* to Modes or Accidents, and that general, indetermined *Idea* of *Something*, is, by the abstraction of the Mind, derived also from the simple Ideas of Sensation and Reflection; And thus the Mind, from the positive, simple Ideas got by Sensation and Reflection, comes to the general, relative Idea of Substance, which, without these positive, simple Ideas, it would never have.

This your Lordship (without giving by retail all the particular Steps of the Mind in this business) as well expressed in this more familiar Way: *We find we can have no true conception of any Modes or Accidents, but we must conceive a* Substratum, *or Subject, wherein they are; since it is a repugnancy to our conceptions of things, that Modes or Accidents should Subsist by themselves.*

Hence your Lordship calls it the *Rational* Idea *of Substances.* And says, *I grant that by Sensation and Reflection, we come to know the Powers and Properties of things; but our Reason is satisfied that there must be something beyond these, because it is impossible that they should Subsist by themselves*: So that if this be that which your Lordship means *by the rational* Idea *of Substances*, I see nothing there is in it against what I have said, that it is founded on simple *Ideas* of Sensation or Reflection, and that it is a very obscure *Idea.*

Your Lordships Conclusion from you foregoing Words, is, *And so we may be certain of some things which we have not by those Ideas*; which is a Proposition, whose precise meaning your Lordship will forgive me, if I profess, as it stand there, I do not understand. For it is uncertain to me whether your Lordship means, we may certainly know the Existence of something which we have not by those *Ideas*; or certainly know the distinct Properties of something which we have *not by those Ideas*; or certainly know the truth of some Proposition, *which we have not by those Ideas*; for to be certain of *something* may signifie either of these: But in which soever of these it be meant, I do not see how I am concerned in it.

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

### *Of* Ideas *of one Senſe.*

*Diviſion of Simple* Ideas.

§. 1. THE better to conceive the *Ideas*, we receive from Senſation, it may not be amiſs for us to conſider them, in reference to the different ways, whereby they make their Approaches to our Minds, and make themſelves perceivable by us.

*Firſt*, Then, there are ſome, which come into our Minds *by one Senſe* only.

*Secondly*, There are others, that convey themſelves into the Mind *by more Senſes than one.*

*Thirdly*, Others that are had from *Reflection* only.

*Fourthly*, There are ſome that make themſelves way, and are ſuggeſted to the Mind, *by all the ways of Senſation and Reflection.*

We ſhall conſider them apart under theſe ſeveral Heads.

*Firſt*, There are *ſome* Ideas, *which have admittance only through one Senſe*, which is peculiarly adapted to receive them. Thus Light and Colours, as White, Red, Yellow, Blue; with their ſeveral Degrees or Shades, and Mixtures, as Green, Scarlet, Purple. Sea-green, and the reſt, come in only by the Eyes: All kind of Noiſes, Sounds, and Tones only by the Ears: The ſeveral Taſtes and Smells, by the Noſe and Palate. And if theſe Organs, or the Nerves which are the Conduits, to convey them from without to their Audience in the Brain, the Mind's Preſence-room (as I may ſo call it) are any of them ſo diſordered, as not to perform their Functions, they have no Poſtern to be admitted by; no other way to bring themſelves into view, and be perceived by the Underſtanding.

The moſt conſiderable of thoſe, belonging to the Touch, are Heat and Cold, and Solidity; all the reſt, conſiſting almoſt wholly in the ſenſible Configuration, as ſmooth and rough; or elſe more, or leſs firm adheſion of the Parts, as hard and ſoft, tough and brittle, are obvious enough.

§. 2. I think, it will be needleſs to enumerate all the particular *ſimple Ideas*, belonging to each Senſe. Nor indeed is it poſ-

sible, if we would, there being a great many *more* of them belonging to most of the Senses, *than we have Names for.* The variety of Smells, which are as many almost, if not more than Species of Bodies in the World, do most of them want Names. *Sweet* and *Stinking* commonly serve our turn for these *Ideas*, which in effect, is little more than to call them pleasing or displeasing; though the smell of a Rose, and Violet, both sweet, are certainly very distinct *Ideas*. Nor are the different Tastes that by our Palates we receive *Ideas* of, much better provided with Names. Sweet, Bitter, Sowr, Harsh, and Salt, are almost all the Epithets we have to denominate that numberless variety of Relishes, which are to be found distinct, not only in almost every sort of Creatures, but in the different Parts of the same Plant, Fruit, or Animal. The same may be said of Colours and Sounds. I shall therefore in the Account of simple *Ideas*, I am here giving, content my self to set down only such, as are most material to our present Purpose, or are in themselves less apt to be taken notice of, though they are very frequently the Ingredients of our complex *Ideas*, amongst which, I think, I may well account Solidity; which therefore I shall treat of in the next Chapter.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Of Solidity.*

*We receive this* Idea *from Touch.*

§. 1. THE *Idea* of *Solidity* we receive by our Touch; and it arises from the resistance which we find in Body, to the entrance of any other Body into the Place it possesses, till it has left it. There is no *Idea*, which we receive more constantly from Sensation, than *Solidity*. Whether we move, or rest, in what Posture soever we are, we always feel something under us, that supports us, and hinders our farther sinking downwards; and the Bodies which we daily handle, make us perceive, that whilst they remain between them, they do by an insurmountable Force, hinder the approach of the parts of our Hands that press them. That which thus hinders the approach of two Bodies, when they are moving one towards another, I call *Solidity*. I will not dispute, whether this acceptation

tation of the Word *solid* be nearer to its Original Signification, than that which Mathematicians use it in: It suffices, that I think, the common Notion of Solidity will allow, if not justifie, this Use of it; but if any one think it better to call it *Impenetrability*, he has my Consent. Only I have thought the Term *Solidity*, the more proper to express this *Idea*, not only because of its vulgar use in that Sense; but also, because it carries something more of positive in it, than *Impenetrability*, which is negative; and is, perhaps, more a consequence of *Solidity*, than *Solidity* it self. This of all other, seems the *Idea* most intimately connected with, and essential to Body, so as no where else to be found or imagined, but only in matter: And though our Senses take no notice of it, but in masses of matter, of a bulk sufficient to cause a Sensation in us; Yet the Mind, having once got this *Idea* from such grosser sensible Bodies, traces it farther; and considers It, as well as Figure, in the minutest Particle of Matter, that can exist; and finds it inseparably inherent in Body, where-ever, or however modified.

*Solidity fills Space.*

§. 2. This is the *Idea* belongs to Body, whereby we conceive it *to fill space*. The *Idea* of which filling of space, is, That where we imagine any space taken up by a solid Substance, we conceive it so to possess it, that it excludes all other solid Substances; and, will for ever hinder any two other Bodies, that move towards one another in a strait Line, from coming to touch one another, unless it removes from between them in a Line, not parallel to that which they move in. This *Idea* of it, the Bodies which we ordinarily handle, sufficiently furnish us with.

*Distinct from Space.*

§. 3. This Resistance, whereby it keeps other Bodies out of the space which it possesses, is so great, that no force, how great soever, can surmount it. All the Bodies in the World, pressing a drop of Water on all sides, will never be able to overcome the Resistance which it will make, as soft as it is, to their approaching one another, till it be removed out of their way: Whereby our *Idea* of *Solidity* is *distinguished* both *from pure space*, which is capable neither of Resistance nor Motion; and from the ordinary *Idea* of *Hardness*. For a Man may conceive two Bodies at a distance, so as they may approach one another, without touching or displacing any solid thing, till their Superficies come to meet: Whereby, I think, we have the clear *Idea* of Space without *Solidity*. For (not to go so far as annihilation of any particular Body) I ask, whether a Man cannot have the *Idea* of

the motion of one single Body alone, without any other succeeding immediately into its Place? I think, 'tis evident he can: The *Idea* of Motion in one Body, no more including the *Idea* of Motion in another, than the *Idea* of a square Figure in one Body includes the *Idea* of a square Figure in another. I do not ask, whether Bodies do so exist, that the motion of one Body cannot really be without the motion of another. To determine this either way, is to beg the Question for, or against a *Vacuum*. But my Question is, whether one cannot have the *Idea* of one Body moved, whilst others are at rest? And, I think, this no one will deny: If so, then the Place it deserted, gives us the *Idea* of pure Space without Solidity, whereinto another Body may enter, without either Resistance or Protrusion of any thing. When the Sucker in a Pump is drawn, the space it filled in the Tube is certainly the same, whether any other Body follows the motion of the Sucker or no: Nor does it imply a contradiction, that upon the motion of one Body, another, that is only contiguous to it, should not follow it. The Necessity of such a motion, is built only on the Supposition, that the World is full; but not on the distinct *Ideas* of Space and Solidity: which are as different as Resistance and not Resistance, Protrusion and not Protrusion. And that Men have *Ideas* of Space without Body, their very Disputes about a *Vacuum* plainly demonstrate, as is shewed in another Place. As

*From Hardness.*

§. 4. *Solidity* is hereby also *differenced from Hardness*, in that Solidity consists in repletion, and so an utter Exclusion of other Bodies out of the space it possesses; but Hardness, in a firm Cohesion of the parts of Matter, making up masses of a sensible bulk, so that the whole does not easily change its Figure. And indeed Hard and Soft are Names that we give to things, only in relation to the Constitutions of our own Bodies; that being generally call'd hard by us, which will put us to Pain, sooner than change Figure by the pressure of any part of our Bodies; and that, on the contrary, soft, which changes the Situation of its parts upon an easie, and unpainful touch.

But this Difficulty of changing the Situation of the sensible parts amongst themselves, or of the Figure of the whole, gives no more Solidity to the hardest Body in the World, than to the softest; nor is an Adamant one jot more solid than Water. For though the two flat sides of two pieces of Marble, will more easily approach each other, between which there is nothing but Water or Air, than if there be a Diamond between them: Yet

it

it is not, that the parts of the Diamond are more solid than those of Water, or resist more; but because the parts of Water, being more easily separable from each other, they will by a side-motion be more easily removed, and give way to the approach of the two pieces of Marble: But if they could be kept from making Place, by that side-motion, they would eternally hinder the approach of these two pieces of Marble, as much as the Diamond; and 'twould be as impossible by any force, to surmount their Resistance, as to surmount the Resistance of the parts of a Diamond. The softest Body in the World will as invincibly resist the coming together of any two other Bodies, if it be not put out of the way, but remain between them, as the hardest that can be found, or imagin'd. He that shall fill a yielding soft Body well with Air or Water, will quickly find its Resistance: And he that thinks, that nothing but Bodies, that are hard, can keep his Hands from approaching one another, may be pleased to make a trial, with the Air inclosed in a Foot-Ball. The Experiment I have been told was made at *Florence*, with a hollow Globe of Gold fill'd with Water, and exactly closed, farther shews the solidity of so soft a Body as Water. For the Golden Globe thus filled, being put into a Press, which was driven by the extreme force of Skrews, the Water made it self way through the Pores of that very close Metal, and finding no room for a nearer approach of its Particles within, got to the outside, where it rose like a Dew, and so fell in Drops, before the sides of the Globe could be made to yield to the violent compression of the Engine, that squeezed it.

§. 5. By this *Idea* of Solidity, is the Extension of Body distinguished from the Extension of Space. The Extension of Body being nothing, but the cohesion or continuity of solid, separable, moveable Parts; and the extension of Space, the continuity of unsolid, inseparable, and immoveable Parts. *Upon the Solidity of Bodies* also *depends their mutual Impulse, Resistance, and Protrusion.* Of pure Space then, and Solidity, there are several (amongst which, I confess my self one) who persuade themselves, they have clear and distinct *Ideas*; and that they can think on Space, without any thing in it, that resists, or is protruded by Body. This is the *Idea* of pure Space, which they think they have as clear, as any *Idea* they can have of the Extension of Body; the *Idea* of the distance, between the opposite Parts of a concave Superficies, being equally as clear, without, as with the *Idea* of any solid Parts between;

*On Solidity depends Impulse, Resistance, and Protrusion.*

between; and on the other side, they persuade themselves, That they have, distinct from that of pure Space, the *Idea* of something that fills Space, that can be protruded by the impulse of other Bodies, or resist their Motion. If there be others, that have not these two *Ideas* distinct but confound them, and make but one of them, I know not, how Men, who have the same *Idea*, under different Names, or different *Ideas*, under the same Name, can, in that Case, talk with one another, any more than a Man, who not being Blind, or Deaf, has distinct *Ideas* of the Colour of Scarlet, and the Sound of a Trumpet, could discourse concerning Scarlet-Colour with the Blind Man, I mention in another Place, who fancied, that the *Idea* of Scarlet was like the Sound of a Trumpet.

*What it is.*

§. 6. If any one asks me, *What this Solidity is*, I send him to his Senses to inform him: Let him put a Flint, or a Foot-Ball between his Hands; and then endeavour to join them, and he will know. If he thinks this not a sufficient Explication of Solidity, what it is, and wherein it consists; I promise to tell him, what it is, and wherein it consists, when he tells me what thinking is, or wherein it consists; or explain to me, what Extension or Motion is, which, perhaps, seems much easier. The simple *Ideas* we have are such, as experience teaches them us; but if beyond that, we endeavour, by Words, to make them clearer in the Mind, we shall succeed no better, than if we went about to clear up the Darkness of a Blind Man's mind, by talking; and to discourse into him the *Ideas* of Light and Colours. The Reason of this, I shall shew, in another Place.

---

## CHAP. V.

### *Of Simple* Ideas, *of divers Senses.*

THE *Ideas* we get by more than one Sense, are of *Space*, or *Extension*, *Figure*, *Rest*, and *Motion*: For these make perceivable Impressions, both on the Eyes and Touch; and we can receive and convey into our Minds the *Ideas* of our Extension, Figure, Motion, and Rest of Bodies, both by seeing and feeling. But having occasion to speak more at large of these in another place, I here only enumerate them.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Of Simple* Ideas *of Reflection.*

§. 1. THE Mind receiving the *Ideas*, mentioned in the foregoing Chapters, from without, when it turns its view inward upon it ſelf, and obſerves its own Actions about thoſe *Ideas* it has, takes from thence other *Ideas*, which are as capable to be the Objects of its Contemplation, as any of thoſe it received from foreign things.

*Are the Operations of the Mind about its other* Ideas.

§. 2. The two great and principal Actions of the Mind, which are moſt frequently conſidered, and which are ſo frequent, that every one that pleaſes, may take notice of 'em in himſelf, are theſe two:

*Perception*, or *Thinking*, and
*Volition*, or *Willing*.

*The* Idea *of Perception, and* Idea *of Willing, we have from Reflection.*

The Power of Thinking is called the *Underſtanding*, and the Power of Volition is called the *Will*, and theſe two Powers or Abilities in the Mind are denominated *Faculties*. Of ſome of the Modes of theſe ſimple *Ideas* of Reflection, ſuch as are *Remembrance*, *Diſcerning*, *Reaſoning*, *Judging*, *Knowledge*, *Faith*, &c. I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter.

## CHAP VII.

### *Of Simple* Ideas *of both Senſation and Reflection.*

§. 1. THere be other ſimple *Ideas*, which convey themſelves into the Mind, by all the ways of Senſation and Reflection, *viz.*

*Pleaſure, and Pain.*

*Pleaſure*, or *Delight*, and its oppoſite.
*Pain*, or *Uneaſineſs*.
*Power*.
*Exiſtence*.
*Unity*.

§. 2.

§. 2. *Delight*, or *Uneaſineſs*, one or other of them join themſelves to almoſt all our *Ideas*, both of Senſation and Reflection: And there is ſcarce any affection of our Senſes from without, any retired thought of our Mind within, which is not able to produce in us *Pleaſure* or *Pain*. By *Pleaſure* and *Pain*, I would be underſtood to ſignifie whatſoever delights or moleſts us; whether it ariſes from the thoughts of our Minds, or any thing operating on our Bodies. For whether we call it Satisfaction, Delight, Pleaſure, Happineſs, *&c.* on the one ſide; or Uneaſineſs, Trouble, Pain, Torment, Anguiſh, Miſery, *&c.* on the other, they are ſtill but different degrees of the ſame thing, and belong to the *Ideas* of *Pleaſure* and *Pain*, Delight, or Uneaſineſs; which are the Names I ſhall moſt commonly uſe for thoſe two ſorts of *Ideas*.

§. 3. The infinite Wiſe Author of our Being, having given us the Power over ſeveral parts of our Bodies, to move or keep them at reſt, as we think fit; and alſo by the motion of them, to move our ſelves, and our contiguous Bodies, in which conſiſts all the Actions of Body: Having alſo given a Power to our Minds, in ſeveral Inſtances, to chuſe, amongſt its *Ideas*, which it will think on, and to purſue the enquiry of this or that Subject with conſideration and attention, to excite us to theſe Actions of thinking and motion, that we are capable of, has been pleaſed to join to ſeveral Thoughts, and ſeveral Senſations, a *Perception* of *Delight*. If this were wholly ſeparated from all our outward Senſations, and inward Thoughts, we ſhould have no reaſon to prefer one Thought or Action, to another; Negligence, to Attention; or Motion to Reſt. And ſo we ſhould neither ſtir our Bodies, nor employ our Minds; but let our Thoughts (if I may ſo call it) run a drift, without any direction or deſign; and ſuffer the *Ideas* of our Minds, like unregarded ſhadows, to make their appearances there, as it happen'd, without attending to them. In which ſtate, Man, however furniſhed with the Faculties of Underſtanding and Will, would be a very idle unactive Creature, and paſs his time only in a lazy lethargick Dream. It has therefore pleaſed our Wiſe Creator, to annex to ſeveral Objects, and to the *Ideas* which we receive from them, as alſo to ſeveral of our Thoughts, a concomitant pleaſure, and that in ſeveral Objects, to ſeveral degrees, that thoſe Faculties which he had endowed us with, might not remain wholly idle, and unemploy'd by us.

§. 4. *Pain* has the ſame efficacy and uſe to ſet us on work, that Pleaſure has, we being as ready to employ our Faculties to avoid

avoid that, as to purſue this: Only this is worth our conſideration, That *Pain is often produced by the ſame Objects and* Ideas, *that produce Pleaſure* in us. This their near Conjunction, which makes us often feel Pain in the Senſations where we expected Pleaſure, gives us new occaſion of admiring the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of our Maker, who deſigning the preſervation of our Being has annexed Pain to the application of many things to our Bodies, to warn us of the harm that they will do; and as advices to withdraw from them. But he not deſigning our preſervation barely, but the preſervation of every Part and Organ in its perfection, hath, in many caſes, annexed pain to thoſe very *Ideas*, which delight us. Thus Heat, that is very agreeable to us in one degree, by a little greater increaſe of it, proves no ordinary torment; and the moſt pleaſant of all ſenſible Objects, Light it ſelf, if there be too much of it, if increaſed beyond a due proportion to our Eyes, cauſes a very painful Senſation. Which is wiſely and favourably ſo ordered by Nature, that when any Object does, by the vehemency, of its operation, diſorder the inſtruments of Senſation whoſe ſtructures cannot but be very nice and delicate, we might by the pain, be warned to withdraw, before the Organ be quite put out of order, and ſo be unfitted for its proper Functions for the future. The conſideration of thoſe Objects that produce it, may well perſwade us, That this is the end or uſe of Pain. For though great Light be inſufferable to our Eyes, yet the higheſt degree of Darkneſs does not at all diſeaſe them; becauſe the cauſing no diſorderly motion in it, leaves that curious Organ unharm'd, in its natural ſtate. But yet exceſs of Cold, as well as Heat, pains us; becauſe it is equally diſtructive to that temper, which is neceſſary to the preſervation of Life, and the exerciſe of the ſeveral functions of the Body, and which conſiſts in a moderate degree of Warmth; or, if you pleaſe, a motion of the inſenſible parts of our Bodies, confin'd within certain bounds.

§. 5. Beyond all this, we may find another reaſon *why* God hath ſcattered up and down *ſeveral degrees of Pleaſure and Pain, in all the things that environ and affect us;* and blended them together, in almoſt all that our Thoughts and Senſes have to do with; that we finding Imperfection, Diſſatisfaction, and want of compleat Happineſs, in all the Enjoyments which the Creatures can afford us, might be led to ſeek it in the enjoyment of him, *with whom there is fulneſs of Joy, and at whoſe Right Hand are Pleaſures for evermore.*

§. 6. Though what I have here ſaid, may not, perhaps, make

*Pleaſure and Pain.*

make the *Ideas of Pleaſure and Pain* clearer to us, than our own Experience does, which is the only way that we are capable of having them; yet the conſideration of the Reaſon, why they are annexed to ſo many other *Ideas*, ſerving to give us due ſentiments of the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of the Soveraign Diſpoſer of all Things, may not be unſuitable to the main end of theſe Enquiries: The knowledge and veneration of Him, being the chief end of all our Thoughts, and the proper buſineſs of all Underſtandings.

*Exiſtence and Unity.*

§. 7. *Exiſtence* and *Unity*, are two other *Ideas*, that are ſuggeſted to the Underſtanding, by every Object without, and every *Idea* within. When *Ideas* are in our Minds, we conſider them as being actually there, as well as we conſider things to be actually without us; which is, that they Exiſt, or have *Exiſtence*: And whatever we can conſider as one thing, whether a real Being, or *Idea*, ſuggeſts to the Underſtanding, the *Idea* of *Unity*.

*Power.*

§. 8. *Power* alſo is another of thoſe ſimple *Ideas* which we receive from *Senſation and Reflection*. For obſerving in our ſelves, that we can, at pleaſure, move ſeveral parts of our Bodies, which were at reſt; the effects alſo, that natural Bodies are able to produce in one another, occurring every moment to our Senſes, we both theſe ways get the *Idea* of *Power*.

*Succeſſion.*

§. 9. Beſides theſe, there is another *Idea*, which though ſuggeſted by our Senſes, yet is more conſtantly offered us, by what paſſes in our own Minds; and that is the *Idea* of *Succeſſion*. For if we look immediately into our ſelves, and reflect on what is obſervable there, we ſhall find our *Ideas* always, whilſt we are awake, or have any thought paſſing in train, one going, and another coming, without intermiſſion.

*Simple Ideas the Materials of all our Knowledge.*

§. 10. Theſe, if they are not all, are at leaſt (as I think) the moſt conſiderable of thoſe *ſimple Ideas* which the Mind has, and out of which is made all its other Knowledge; all which it receives only by the two forementioned ways of *Senſation* and *Reflection*.

Nor let any one think theſe too narrow bounds for the capacious Mind of Man to expatiate in, which takes its flight farther than the Stars, and cannot be confined by the limits of the World; that extends its thoughts often, even beyond the utmoſt expanſion of Matter, and makes excurſions into that incompre-

comprehenſible *Inane.* I grant all this, but deſire any one to aſſign any *ſimple Idea,* which is not *received from* one of *thoſe Inlets* before-mentioned, or any *complex Idea* not *made out of thoſe ſimple ones.* Nor will it be ſo ſtrange, to think theſe few ſimple *Ideas* ſufficient to employ the quickeſt Thought, or largeſt Capacity; and to furniſh the Materials of all that various Knowledge, and more various Fancies and Opinions of all Mankind, if we conſider how many Words may be made out of the various compoſition of Twenty Four Letters; or if going one ſtep farther, we will but reflect on the variety of combinations may be made, with barely one of the above-mentioned *Ideas, viz.* Number, whoſe ſtock is inexhauſtible, and truly infinite: And what a large and immenſe field, doth Extenſion alone afford the Mathematicians?

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Some farther Conſiderations concerning our Simple* Ideas.

*Poſitive* Ideas *from privative Cauſes.*

§. 1. CONcerning the ſimple *Ideas* of Senſation 'tis to be conſidered, That whatſoever is ſo conſtituted in Nature, as to be able, by affecting our Senſes, to cauſe any Perception in the Mind, doth thereby produce in the Underſtanding a ſimple *Idea*; which, whatever be the external cauſe of it, when it comes to be taken notice of, by our diſcerning Faculty, it is by the Mind looked on and conſidered there, to be a real *poſitive Idea* in the Underſtanding, as much as any other whatſoever; though perhaps, the cauſe of it be but a privation in the ſubject.

§. 2. Thus the *Idea* of Heat and Cold, Light and Darkneſs, White and Black, Motion and Reſt, are equally clear and *poſitive Ideas* in the Mind; though, perhaps, ſome of *the cauſes* which produce them, are barely *Privations* in thoſe Subjects, from whence our Senſes derive thoſe *Ideas.* Theſe the Underſtanding, in its view of them, conſiders all as diſtinct poſitive *Ideas,* without taking notice of the Cauſes that produce them; which is an enquiry not belonging to the *Idea,* as it is in the Underſtanding; but to the nature of the thing exiſting without

out us. These are two very different things, and carefully to be distinguished; it being one thing to perceive, and know the *Idea* of White or Black, and quite another to examine what kind of Particles they must be, and how ranged in the Superficies, to make any Object appear White or Black.

§. 3. A Painter or Dyer, who never enquired into their Causes, hath the *Ideas* of White and Black, and other Colours, as clearly, perfectly, and distinctly in his Understanding, and perhaps more distinctly, than the Philosopher, who had busied himself in considering their Natures, and thinks he knows how far either of them is in its cause positive or privative; and the *Idea of Black* is no less *positive* in his Mind, than that of White, *however the cause* of that Colour in the external Object, may *be only a privation.*

§. 4. If it were the design of my present Undertaking, to enquire into the natural causes and manner of Perception, I should offer this as a reason *why a privative cause might*, in some cases at least, *produce a positive Idea, viz.* That all Sensation being produced in us, only by different degrees and modes of Motion in our animal Spirits, variously agitated by external Objects, the abatement of any former motion, must as necessarily produce a new Sensation, as the variation or increase of it; and so introduce a new *Idea*, which depends only on a different motion of the animal Spirits in that Organ.

§. 5. But whether this be so, or no, I will not here determine, but appeal to every one's own Experience, whether the shadow of a Man, though it consists of nothing but the absence of Light (and the more the absence of Light is, the more discernable is the shadow) does not, when a Man looks on it, cause as clear and positive an *Idea* in his Mind, as a Man himself, though covered over with clear Sun shine? And the Picture of a Shadow, is a positive thing. Indeed, we have *negative Names*, which stand not directly for positive *Ideas*, but for their absence, such as *Insipid*, *Silence*, *Nihil*, &c. which Words denote positive *Ideas*; *v. g. Taste*, *Sound*, *Being*, with a signification of their absence.

*Positive* Ideas *from privative Causes.*

§. 6. And thus one may truly be said to see Darkness. For supposing a Hole perfectly Dark, from whence no Light is reflected, 'tis certain one may see the Figure of it, or it may be Painted; or whether the Ink, I write with, makes any other *Idea*, is a Question. The privative Causes I have here assigned of positive *Ideas*, are according to the common Opinion; but in truth,

truth, it will be hard to determine, whether there be really any *Ideas* from a privative cause, till it be determined, *Whether Rest be any more a Privation than Motion.*

§. 7. To discover the nature of our *Ideas* the better, and to discourse of them intelligibly, it will be convenient to distinguish them, as they are *Ideas* or Perceptions in our Minds; and as they are modifications of matter in the Bodies that cause such Perceptions in us; that so we *may not* think (as perhaps usually is done) that they are exactly the Images and *Resemblances* of something inherent in the subject; most of those of Sensation being in the Mind no more the likeness of something existing without us, than the Names, that stand for them are the likeness of our *Ideas*, which yet upon hearing, they are apt to excite in us. Ideas *in the Mind, Qualities in Bodies.*

§. 8. Whatsoever the Mind perceives in it self, or is the immediate object of Perception, Thought, or Understanding, that I call *Idea*; and the Power to produce any *Idea* in our Mind, I call *Quality* of the Subject wherein that Power is. Thus a Snow-ball having the Power to produce in us the *Ideas* of *White*, *Cold*, and *Round*, the Powers to produce those *Ideas* in us, as they are in the Snow-ball, I call *Qualities*; and as they are Sensations, or Perceptions, in our Understandings, I call them *Ideas*; which *Ideas*, if I speak of sometimes, as in the things themselves, I would be understood to mean those Qualities in the Objects which produce them in us.

§. 9. Qualities thus considered in Bodies are, First such as are utterly inseparable from the Body, in what estate soever it be; such as in all the alterations and changes it suffers, all the force can be used upon it, it constantly keeps; and such as Sense constantly finds in every Particle of Matter, which has bulk enough to be perceived, and the Mind finds inseparable from every Particle of Matter, though less than to make it self singly be perceived by our Senses. *v. g.* Take a Grain of Wheat, divide it into two Parts, each Part has still *Solidity*, *Extension*, *Figure*, and *Mobility*; divide it again, and it retains still the same Qualities: and so divide it on, till the parts become insensible, they must retain still each of them all those Qualities. For division (which is all that a Mill, or Pestel, or any other Body, does upon another, in reducing it to insensible parts) can never take away either Solidity, Extension, Figure, or Mobility from any Body, but only makes two, or more distinct separate masses of Matter, of that which was but one before; all which distinct masses, reckon'd *Primary Qualities.*

kon'd as ſo many diſtinct Bodies, after diviſion make a certain Number. Theſe I call *original* or *primary Qualities* of Body, which I think we may obſerve to produce ſimple *Ideas* in us, *viz.* Solidity, Extenſion, Figure, Motion, or Reſt, and Number.

§. 10. *2dly*, Such *Qualities*, which in truth are nothing in the Objects themſelves, but Powers to produce various Senſations in us by their *primary Qualities*, *i. e.* by the Bulk, Figure, Texture, and Motion of their inſenſible parts, as Colours, Sounds, Taſtes, *&c.* Theſe I call *Secondary Qualities*. To theſe might be added a third ſort, which are allowed to be barely Powers, though they are as much real Qualities in the Subject, as thoſe which I, to comply with the common way of ſpeaking, call *Qualities*, but for diſtinction *Secondary Qualities*. For the power in Fire to produce a new Colour, or conſiſtency in Wax or Clay by its primary Qualities, is as much a Quality in Fire, as the power it has to produce in me a new *Idea* or Senſation of Warmth or Burning, which I felt not before, by the ſame primary Qualities, *viz.* The Bulk, Texture and Motion of its inſenſible parts.

*How primary Qualities produce their Ideas.*

§. 11. The next thing to be conſider'd, is how *Bodies* produce *Ideas* in us, and that is manifeſtly *by impulſe*, the only way which we can conceive Bodies operate in.

§. 12. If then external Objects be not united to our Minds, when they produce *Ideas* in it; and yet we perceive *theſe original Qualities* in ſuch of them as ſingly fall under our Senſes, 'tis evident, that ſome Motion muſt be thence continued by our Nerves, or animal Spirits, by ſome parts of our Bodies, to the Brains, or the ſeat of Senſation, there to *produce in our Minds the particular* Ideas *we have of them.* And ſince the Extenſion, Figure, Number, and Motion of Bodies of an obſervable bigneſs, may be perceived at a diſtance *by* the ſight, 'tis evident ſome ſingly imperceptible Bodies muſt come from them to the Eyes, and thereby convey to the Brain ſome *Motion*, which produces theſe *Ideas*, which we have of them in us.

*How Secondary.*

§. 13. After the ſame manner, that the *Ideas* of theſe original Qualities are produced in us, we may conceive, that the *Ideas of Secondary Qualities* are alſo *produced*, viz. *by the operation of inſenſible Particles on our Senſes.* For it being manifeſt, that there are Bodies, and good ſtore of Bodies, each whereof are ſo ſmall, that we cannot, by any of our Senſes diſcover either their Bulk, Figure, or Motion, as is evident in the Particles of the Air and Water,

Water, and other extremely ſmaller than thoſe, perhaps, as much ſmaller than the Particles of Air, or Water, as the Particles of Air or Water, are ſmaller than Peaſe or Hail-ſtones. Let us ſuppoſe at preſent, that the different Motions and Figures, Bulk and Number of ſuch Particles, affecting the ſeveral Organs of our Senſes, produce in us thoſe different Senſations, which we have from the Colours and Smells of Bodies, *v. g.* that a Violet, by the impulſe of ſuch inſenſible Particles of matter of peculiar Figures, and Bulks, and in different degrees and modifications of their Motions, cauſes the *Ideas* of the Blue Colour, and ſweet Scent of that Flower to be produced in our Minds. It being no more impoſſible, to conceive, that God ſhould annex ſuch *Ideas* to ſuch Motions, with which they have no ſimilitude; than that he ſhould annex the *Idea* of Pain to the Motion of a piece of Steel dividing our Fleſh, with which that *Idea* hath no reſemblance.

§. 14. What I have ſaid concerning *Colours* and *Smells*, may be underſtood alſo of *Taſtes*, and *Sounds, and other the like ſenſible Qualities*; which, whatever reality we by miſtake, attribute to them, are in truth nothing in the Objects themſelves, but Powers to produce various Senſations in us, and depend *on thoſe primary Qualities, viz.* Bulk, Figure, Texture, and Motion of parts; as I have ſaid.

§. 15. From whence I think it is eaſy to draw this Obſervation, that the *Ideas of primary Qualities* of Bodies, *are Reſemblances* of them, and their Patterns do really exiſt in the Bodies themſelves; but the *Ideas, produced* in us *by* theſe *Secondary Qualities, have no reſemblance* of them at all. There is nothing like our *Ideas*, exiſting in the Bodies themſelves. They are in the Bodies, we denominate from them, only a Power to produce thoſe Senſations in us: And what is Sweet, Blue, or Warm in *Idea*, is but the certain Bulk, Figure, and Motion of the inſenſible Parts in the Bodies themſelves, which we call ſo.

*Ideas of primary Qualities are reſemblances; of ſecondary, not.*

§. 16. *Flame* is denominated *Hot* and *Light*; *Snow*, *White* and *Cold*; and *Manna*, *White* and *Sweet*, from the *Ideas* they produce in us. Which Qualities are commonly thought to be the ſame in thoſe Bodies, that thoſe *Ideas* are in us, the one the perfect reſemblance of the other, as they are in a Mirror; and it would by moſt Men be judged very extravagant, if one ſhould ſay otherwiſe. And yet he, that will conſider, that *the ſame Fire*, that at one diſtance *produces* in us the Senſation of *Warmth*, does at a nearer approach, produce in us the far different Senſation

of *Pain*, ought to bethink himself, what Reason he has to say, That his *Idea* of *Warmth*, which was produced in him by the Fire, is actually *in the Fire*; and his *Idea* of *Pain*, which the same Fire produced in him the same way, is *not* in the *Fire*. Why is Whiteness and Coldness in Snow, and Pain not, when it produces the one and the other *Idea* in us; and can do neither, but by the Bulk, Figure, Number, and Motion of its solid Parts?

§. 17. The particular *Bulk, Number, Figure, and Motion of the parts of Fire, or Snow, are really in them*, whether any one's Senses perceive them or no; and therefore they may be called *real Qualities*, because they really exist in those Bodies. But *Light, Heat, Whiteness*, or *Coldness, are no more really in them, than Sickness or Pain is in* Manna. Take away the Sensation of them; let not the Eyes see Light, or Colours, nor the Ears hear Sounds; let the Palate not Taste, nor the Nose Smell, and all Colours, Tastes, Odors, and Sounds, as they are such particular *Ideas*, vanish and cease, and are reduced to their Causes, *i. e.* Bulk, Figure, and Motions of Parts.

§. 18. A piece of *Manna* of a sensible Bulk, is able to produce in us the *Idea* of a round or square Figure; and, by being removed from one place to another, the *Idea* of Motion. This *Idea* of Motion represents it, as it really is in the *Manna* moving: A Circle or Square are the same, whether in *Idea* or Existence; in the Mind, or in the *Manna*: And this, both *Motion and Figure are really in the Manna*, whether we take notice of them or no: This every Body is ready to agree to. Besides, *Manna* by the Bulk, Figure, Texture, and Motion of its Parts, has a Power to produce the Sensations of Sickness, and sometimes of acute Pains, or Gripings in us. That these *Ideas* of *Sickness and Pain are not in the* Manna, but Effects of its Operations on us, and are no where when we feel them nor: This also every one readily agrees to. And yet Men are hardly to be brought to think, that *Sweetness and Whiteness are not really in Manna*; which are but the effects of the Operations of *Manna*, by the motion, size, and figure of its Particles on the Eyes and Palate; as the Pain and Sickness caused by *Manna*, are confessedly nothing, but the effects of its Operations on the Stomach and Guts, by the size, motion, and figure of its insensible parts; (for by nothing else can a Body Operate, as has been proved:) As if it could not Operate on the Eyes and Palate, and thereby produce in the Mind particular distinct *Ideas*, which in it self it has not, as well as we allow it can Operate on the Guts and Stomach, and thereby

by produce distinct *Ideas*, which in it self it has not. These *Ideas* being all effects of the Operations of *Manna*, on several parts of our Bodies, by the size, figure, number, and motion of its Parts, why those produced by the Eyes and Palate, should rather be thought to be really in the *Manna*, than those produced by the Stomach and Guts; or why the Pain and Sickness, *Ideas* that are the effects of *Manna*, should be thought to be no where, when they are not felt; and yet the Sweetness and Whiteness, effects of the same *Manna* on other parts of the Body, by ways equally as unknown, should be thought to exist in the *Manna*, when they are not seen nor tasted, would need some Reason to explain.

*Ideas of primary Qualities are resemblances, of secondary, not.*

§. 19. Let us consider the red and white colours in *Porphyre*: Hinder light but from striking on it, and its Colours Vanish; it no longer produces any such *Ideas* in us: Upon the return of Light, it produces these appearances on us again. Can any one think any real alterations are made in the *Porphyre*, by the presence or absence of Light; and that those *Ideas* of whiteness and redness, are really in *Porphyre* in the light, when 'tis plain *it has no colour in the dark?* It has, indeed, such a Configuration of Particles, both Night and Day, as are apt by the Rays of Light rebounding from some parts of that hard Stone, to produce in us the *Idea* of redness, and from others the *Idea* of whiteness: But whiteness or redness are not in it at any time, but such a texture, that hath the power to produce such a Sensation in us.

§. 20. Pound an Almond, and the clear white *Colour* will be altered into a dirty one, and the sweet *Taste* into an oily one. What real Alteration can the beating of the Pestle make in any Body, but an Alteration of the *Texture* of it?

§. 21. *Ideas* being thus distinguished and understood, we may be able to give an Account, how the same Water, at the same time, may produce the *Idea* of Cold by one Hand, and of Heat by the other: Whereas it is impossible, that the same Water, if those *Ideas* were really in it, should at the same time be both Hot and Cold. For if we imagine *Warmth*, as it *is in our Hands*, to be *nothing but a certain sort and degree of Motion in the minute Particles of our Nerves, or animal Spirits*, we may understand, how it is possible, that the same Water may at the same time produce the Sensation of Heat in one Hand, and Cold in the other; which yet Figure never does, that never producing the *Idea* of a square by one Hand, which has produced the

the *Idea* of a Globe by another. But if the Senſation of Heat and Cold, be nothing but the increaſe or diminution of the motion of the minute Parts of our Bodies, cauſed by the Corpuſcles of any other Body, it is eaſie to be underſtood, that if that motion be greater in one Hand, than in the other; if a Body be applied to the two Hands, which has in its minute Particles a greater motion, than in thoſe of one of the Hands, and a leſs than in thoſe of the other, it will encreaſe the motion of the one Hand, and leſſen it in the other, and ſo cauſe the different Senſations of Heat and Cold, that depend thereon.

§. 22. I have in what juſt goes before, been engaged in Phyſical Enquiries a little farther than perhaps I intended. But it being neceſſary, to make the Nature of Senſation a little underſtood, and to make the *difference between the Qualities in Bodies, and the* Ideas *produced by them in the Mind*, to be diſtinctly conceived, without which it were impoſſible to diſcourſe intelligibly of them; I hope, I ſhall be pardoned this little Excurſion into natural Philoſophy; it being neceſſary in our preſent Enquiry, to diſtinguiſh the *primary*, and *real Qualities* of Bodies, which are always in them, (*viz.* Solidity, Extenſion, Figure, Number, and Motion, or Reſt, and are ſometimes perceived by us, *viz.* when the Bodies they are in, are big enough ſingly to be diſcerned (from thoſe *ſecondary* and *imputed Qualities*, which are but the Powers of ſeveral Combinations of thoſe primary ones, when they operate, without being diſtinctly diſcerned; whereby we alſo may come to know what *Ideas* are, and what are not Reſemblances of ſomething really exiſting in the Bodies, we denominate from them.

*Three ſorts of Qualities in Bodies.*

§. 23. The *Qualities* then that are in *Bodies* rightly conſidered, are of *Three ſorts.*

*Firſt*, The *Bulk*, *Figure*, *Number*, *Situation*, and *Motion*, *or Reſt* of their ſolid Parts; thoſe are in them, whether we perceive them or no; and when they are of that ſize, that we can diſcover them, we have by theſe an *Idea* of the thing, as it is in it ſelf, as is plain in artificial things. Theſe I call *primary Qualities.*

*Secondly*, The *Power* that is in any Body, by Reaſon of *its* inſenſible *primary Qualities*, to operate after a peculiar manner on any of our Senſes, and thereby *produce in us* the *different Ideas* of ſeveral Colours, Sounds, Smells, Taſts, &c. Theſe are uſually called ſenſible Qualities.

*Thirdly*, The *Power* that is in any Body, *by* Reaſon of the particular

particular Constitution of *its primary Qualities, to* make such a *change* in the *Bulk, Figure, Texture, and Motion of another Body,* as to make it operate on our Senses, differently from what it did before. Thus the Sun has a Power to make Wax White, and Fire to make Lead Fluid. These *are* usually called Powers.

The First of these, as has been said, I think, may be properly called *real Original,* or *primary Qualities,* because they are in the things themselves, whether they are perceived or no; and upon their different Modifications it is, that the secondary Qualities depend.

The other two, are only Powers to act differently upon others things, which Powers result from the different Modifications of those primary Qualities.

*The 1st. are Resemblances. The 2d. thought Resemblances, but are not. The 3d. neither are, nor are thought so.*

§. 24. But though *these two later sorts of Qualities are Powers barely,* and nothing but Powers, relating to several other Bodies, and resulting from the different Modifications of the original Qualities; yet they are generally otherwise thought of. For *the Second sort, viz.* The Powers to produce several *Ideas* in us by our Senses, *are looked upon as real Qualities, in the things* thus affecting us: But *the Third sort are call'd, and esteem'd barely Powers, v. g.* the *Idea* of Heat, or Light, which we receive by our Eyes, or touch from the Sun, are commonly thought *real Qualities,* existing in the Sun, and something more than meer Powers in it. But when we consider the Sun, in reference to Wax, which it melts or blanches, we look upon the Whiteness and Softness produced in the Wax, not as Qualities in the Sun, but Effects produced by *Powers* in it: Whereas, if rightly considered, these Qualities of Light and Warmth, which are Perceptions in me when I am warmed, or enlightned by the Sun, are no otherwise in the Sun, than the changes made in the Wax, when it is blanched or melted, are in the Sun. They are all of them equally Powers in the Sun, depending on its primary Qualities; whereby it is able in the one case, so to alter the Bulk, Figure, Texture, or Motion of some of the insensible parts of my Eyes, or Hands, as thereby to produce in me the *Idea* of Light or Heat; and in the other, it is able so to alter the Bulk, Figure, Texture, or Motion of the insensible Parts of the Wax, as to make them fit to produce in me the distinct *Ideas* of White and Fluid.

§. 25. The Reason, *Why the one are ordinarily taken for real Qualities, and the other only for bare Powers*, seems to be, because the *Ideas* we have of distinct Colours, Sounds, *&c.* containing nothing at all in them, of Bulk, Figure, or Motion, we are not apt to think them the Effects of these primary Qualities, which appear not to our Senses, to operate in their Production; and with which, they have nor any apparent Congruity, or conceivable Connexion. Hence it is, that we are so forward to imagine, that those *Ideas* are the resemblances of something really existing in the Objects themselves: Since Sensation discovers nothing of Bulk, Figure, or Motion of parts in their Production; nor can Reason shew, how Bodies by their Bulk, Figure, and Motion, should produce in the Mind the *Ideas* of Blue, or Yellow, *&c.* But in the other Case, in the Operations of Bodies, changing the Qualities one of another, we plainly discover, that the Quality produced, hath commonly no resemblance with any thing in the thing producing it; wherefore we look on it as a bare Effect of Power. For though receiving the *Idea* of Heat, or Light, from the Sun, we are apt to think, 'tis a Perception and Resemblance of such a Quality in the Sun: Yet when we see Wax, or a fair Face, receive change of Colour from the Sun, we cannot imagine, that to be the Reception or Resemblance of any thing in the Sun, because we find not those different Colours in the Sun it self. For our Senses, being able to observe a likeness, or unlikeness of sensible Qualities in two different external Objects, we forwardly enough conclude the Production of any sensible Quality in any Subject, to be an Effect of bare Power, and not the Communication of any Quality, which was really in the Efficient, when we find no such sensible Quality in the thing that produced it. But our Senses, not being able to discover any unlikeness between the *Idea* produced in us, and the Quality of the Object producing it, we are apt to imagine, that our *Ideas* are Resemblances of something in the Objects, and not the Effects of certain Powers, placed in the Modification of their Primary Qualities, with which Primary Qualities the *Ideas* produced in us have no resemblance

*Secondary Qualities two fold; First immediately perceivable, 2dly, Mediately perceivable.*

§. 26. To conclude, beside those before mentioned *Primary Qualities* in Bodies, *viz.* Bulk, Figure, Extension, Number, and Motion of their solid Parts; all the rest whereby we take notice of Bodies, and distinguish them one from another, are nothing else, but several Powers in them, depending on those Primary Qualities; whereby they

they are fitted, either by immediately operating on our Bodies, to produce several different *Ideas* in us; or else by operating on other Bodies, so to change their Primary Qualities, as to render them capable of producing *Ideas* in us, different from what before they did. The former of these, I think, may be called *Secondary Qualities, immediately perceivable*: the latter, *Secondary Qualities, mediately perceivable.*

---

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of Perception.*

*It is the first simple* Idea *of Reflection.*

§. 1. *Perception*, as it is the first Faculty of the Mind, exercised about our *Ideas*; so it is the first and simplest *Idea* we have from Reflection, and is by some called Thinking in general. Though Thinking, in the propriety of the *English* Tongue, signifies that sort of operation of the Mind about its *Ideas*, wherein the Mind is active; where it, with some degree of voluntary attention, considers any thing. For in bare naked *Perception*, the Mind is, for the most part, only passive; and what it perceives, it cannot avoid perceiving.

*Perception is only when the Mind receives the Impression.*

§. 2. *What Perception is*, every one will know better by reflecting on what he does himself, when he sees, hears, feels, &c. or thinks, than by any discourse of mine. Whoever reflects on what passes in his own Mind, cannot miss it: And if he does not reflect, all the Words in the World, cannot make him have any notion of it.

§. 3. This is certain, That whatever alterations are made in the Body, if they reach not the Mind; whatever impressions are made on the outward parts, if they are not taken notice of within, there is no Perception. Fire may burn our Bodies, with no other effect, than it does a Billet, unless the motion be continued to the Brain, and there the sense of Heat, or *Idea* of Pain, be produced in the Mind, wherein consists *actual Perception.*

§. 4. How often may a Man observe in himself, that whilst his Mind is intently employ'd in the contemplation of some Objects; and curiously surveying some *Ideas* that are there, it takes no

no notice of impressions of sounding Bodies, made upon the Organ of Hearing, with the same alteration, that uses to be for the producing the *Idea* of Sound? A sufficient impulse there may be on the Organ; but it not reaching the observation of the Mind, there follows no Perception: And though the motion, that uses to produce the *Idea* of Sound, be made in the Ear, yet no sound is heard. Want of Sensation in this case, is not through any defect in the Organ, or that the Man's Ears are less affected, than at other times, when he does hear: But that which uses to produce the *Idea*, though conveyed in by the usual Organ, not being taken notice of in the Understanding, and so imprinting no *Idea* on the Mind, there follows no Sensation. *So that where-ever there is Sense*, or *Perception*, *there some* Idea *is actually produced, and present in the Understanding.*

*Children, tho' they have Ideas in the Womb, have none Innate.*

§. 5. Therefore I doubt not but *Children*, by the exercise of their Senses about Objects, that affect them *in the Womb*, *receive some few* Ideas, before they are Born, as the unavoidable effects, either of the Bodies that environ them, or else of those Wants or Diseases they suffer; amongst which (if one may conjecture concerning things not very capable of examination) I think the *Ideas* of Hunger and Warmth, are two; which probably are some of the first that Children have, and which they scarce ever part with again.

§. 6. But though it be reasonable to imagine, that *Children* receive some *Ideas* before they come into the World, yet these simple *Ideas* are *far from* those *Innate Principles*, which some contend for, and we above have rejected. These here mentioned, being the effects of Sensation, are only from some Affections of the Body, which happen to them there, and so depend on something exterior to the Mind; no otherwise differing in their manner of production from other *Ideas* derived from Sense, but only in the precedency of Time: Whereas those Innate Principles are supposed to be quite of another nature; not coming into the Mind by any accidental alterations in, or operations on the Body; but, as it were, original Characters impressed upon it, in the very first moment of its Being and Constitution.

*Which* Ideas *first, is not evident.*

§. 7. As there are some *Ideas*, which we may reasonably suppose may be introduced into the Minds of Children in the Womb, subservient to the necessities of their Life, and Being there: So after they are Born, *those* Ideas are the *earliest imprinted, which happen to be the sensible Qualities, which first occur* to

to them; amongst which, Light is not the least considerable, nor of the weakest efficacy. And how covetous the Mind is, to be furnished with all such *Ideas*, as have no pain accompanying them, may be a little guess'd, by what is observable in Children new-born, who always turn their Eyes to that part from whence the Light comes, lay them how you please. But the *Ideas* that are most familiar at first, being various, according to the divers circumstances of Childrens first entertainment in the World, the order, wherein the several *Ideas* come at first into the Mind, is very various, and uncertain also; neither is it much material to know it.

*Ideas of Sensation often changed by the Judgment.*

§. 8. We are farther to consider concerning Perception, that the *Ideas we receive by Sensation, are often* in grown People *alter'd by the Judgment*, without our taking notice of it. When we set before our Eyes a round Globe, of any uniform colour, *v. g.* Gold, Alabaster, or Jet, 'tis certain, that the *Idea* thereby imprinted in our Mind, is of a flat Circle variously shadow'd, with several degrees of Light and Brightness coming to our Eyes. But we having by use been accustomed to perceive, what kind of appearance convex Bodies are wont to make in us; what alterations are made in the reflections of Light, by the difference of the sensible Figures of Bodies, the Judgment presently, by an habitual custom, alters the Appearances into their Causes: So that from that, which truly is variety of shadow or colour, collecting the Figure, it makes it pass for a mark of Figure, and frames to it self the Perception of a convex Figure, and an uniform Colour; when the *Idea* we receive from thence, is only a Plain variously Colour'd, as is evident in Painting. To which purpose I shall here Insert a Problem of that very Ingenious and Studious promoter of real Knowledge, the Learned and Worthy Mr. *Molineux*, which he was pleased to send me in a Letter some Months since; and it is this: *Suppose a Man Born Blind, and now adult, and taught by his touch to distinguish between a Cube, and a Sphere of the same metal, and nighly of the same bigness, so as to tell, when he felt one and t'other, which is the Cube, which the Sphere. Suppose then the Cube and Sphere placed on a Table, and the Blind Man to be made to see*: Quære, *Whether by his sight, before he touch'd them, he could now distinguish, and tell, which is the Globe, which the Cube.* To which the acute and judicious Proposer answers: *Not. For though he has obtain'd the experience of, how a Globe, how a Cube affects his touch; yet he has not yet attained the Experience, that what affects his touch so or*

so,

*ſo, muſt affect his ſight ſo or ſo: Or that a protuberant Angle in the Cube, that preſſed his Hand unequally, ſhall appear to his Eye, as it does in the Cube.* I agree with this thinking Gent. whom I am proud to call my Friend, in his anſwer to this his Problem; and am of opinion, that the Blind Man, at firſt ſight, would not be able with certainty to ſay, which was the Globe, which the Cube, whilſt he only ſaw them; though he could unerringly name them by his touch, and certainly diſtinguiſh them by the difference of their Figures felt. This I have ſet down, and leave with my Reader, as an occaſion for him to conſider, how much he may be beholding to Experience, Improvement, and acquired Notions, where he thinks, he has not the leaſt uſe of, or help from them: And the rather, becauſe this obſerving *Gent.* farther adds, that *having upon the occaſion of my Book, propoſed this to divers very ingenious Men, he hardly ever met with one, that at firſt gave the anſwer to it, which he thinks true, till by hearing his Reaſons they were convinced.*

§. 9. But this is not, I think, uſual in any of our *Ideas*, but thoſe received by *Sight*: Becauſe Sight, the moſt comprehenſive of all our Senſes, conveying to our Minds the *Ideas* of Light and Colours, which are peculiar only to that Senſe; and alſo the far different *Ideas* of Space, Figure, and Motion, the ſeveral varieties whereof change the appearances of its proper Object, *viz.* Light and Colours, we bring our ſelves by uſe, to judge of the one by the other. This, in many Caſes, by a ſettled habit, in things whereof we have frequent experience, is performed ſo conſtantly, and ſo quick, that we take that for the Perception of our Senſation, which is an *Idea* formed by our Judgment; ſo that one, *viz.* that of Senſation, ſerves only to excite the other, and is ſcarce taken notice of it ſelf; as a Man who reads or hears with attention and underſtanding, takes little notice of the Characters, or Sounds, but of the *Ideas*, that are excited in him by them.

§. 10. Nor need we wonder, that this is done with ſo little notice, if we conſider, how very *quick* the *Actions of the Mind* are performed: For as it ſelf is thought to take up no ſpace, to have no extenſion; ſo its actions ſeems to require no time, but many of them ſeem to be crouded into an Inſtant. I ſpeak this in compariſon to the Actions of the Body. Any one may eaſily obſerve this in his own Thoughts, who will take the pains to reflect on them. How, as it were in an Inſtant, do our Minds, with one glance, ſee all the parts of a Demonſtration, which may very well be called a long one, if we conſider the time it will

will require to put it into words, and ſtep by ſtep ſhew it another? *Secondly*, We ſhall not be ſo much ſurpriz'd, that this is done in us with ſo little notice, if we conſider, how the facility which we get of doing things, by a cuſtom of doing, makes them often paſs in us without our notice. *Habits*, eſpecially ſuch as are begun very early, come, at laſt, to *produce actions in us, which often eſcape our Obſervation*. How frequently do we, in a day, cover our Eyes with our Eye-lids, without perceiving that we are at all in the dark? Men, that by cuſtom have got the uſe of a By-word, do almoſt in every ſentence, pronounce ſounds, which though taken notice of by others, they themſelves neither hear nor obſerve. And therefore 'tis not ſo ſtrange, that our Mind ſhould often change the *Idea* of its Senſation, into that of its Judgment, and make one ſerve only to excite the other, without our taking notice of it.

*Perception puts the difference between Animals and inferior Beings.*

§. 11. This faculty of *Perception*, ſeems to me to be that, which *puts the diſtinction betwixt the animal Kingdom, and the inferior parts of Nature*. For however Vegetables have, many of them, ſome degrees of Motion, and upon the different application of other Bodies to them, do very briskly alter their Figures and Motions, and ſo have obtained the name of ſenſitive Plants, from a motion, which has ſome reſemblance to that, which in Animals follows upon Senſation: Yet, I ſuppoſe, it is all bare Mechaniſm; and no otherwiſe produced, than the turning of a wild Oat-beard, by the inſinuation of the Particles of Moiſture; or the ſhort'ning of a Rope, by the affuſion of Water. All which is done without any Senſation in the Subject, or the having or receiving any *Ideas*.

§. 12. *Perception*, I believe, is, in ſome degree, *in all ſorts of Animals*; though in ſome, poſſibly, the Avenues, provided by Nature for the reception of Senſations are ſo few, and the Perception, they are received with, ſo obſcure and dull, that it comes extremely ſhort of the quickneſs and variety of Senſations, which is in other Animals: But yet it is ſufficient for, and wiſely adapted to, the ſtate and condition of that ſort of Animals, who are thus made: So that the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of the Maker plainly appears in all the Parts of this ſtupendious Fabrick, and all the ſeveral degrees and ranks of Creatures in it.

§. 13. We may, I think, from the Make of an *Oyſter*, or *Cockle*, reaſonably conclude, that it has not ſo many, nor ſo quick Senſes, as a Man, or ſeveral other Animals; nor if it had, would it, in that ſtate and incapacity of transferring it ſelf from

one

one place to another, be better'd by them. What good would Sight and Hearing do to a Creature, that cannot move it self to, or from the Objects, wherein at a distance it perceives Good or Evil? And would not quickness of Sensation, be an Inconvenience to an Animal, that must lie still, where Chance has once placed it; and there receive the afflux of colder or warmer, clean or foul Water, as it happens to come to it?

§. 14. But yet, I cannot but think, there is some small dull Perception, whereby they are distinguished from perfect Insensibility. And that this may be so, we have plain instances, even in Mankind it self. Take one, in whom decrepid old Age has blotted out the Memory of his past Knowledge, and clearly wiped out the *Ideas* his Mind was formerly stored with; and has, by destroying his Sight, Hearing, and Smell quite, and his Taste to a great degree, stopp'd up almost all the Passages for new ones to enter; or, if there be some of the Inlets yet half open, the Impressions made are scarce perceived, or not at all retained. How far such an one (notwithstanding all that is boasted of Innate Principles) is in his Knowledge, and intellectual Faculties, above the Condition of a *Cockle*, or an *Oyster*, I leave to be considered. And if a Man had passed Sixty Years in such a State, as 'tis, possible he might, as well as Three Days, I wonder what difference there would have been, in any intellectual Perfection, between him, and the lowest degree of Animals.

*Perception the Inlet of the Knowledge.*

§. 15. *Perception* then being *the first step and degree towards Knowledge, and the Inlet of all the Materials of it*, the fewer Senses any Man, as well as any other Creature, hath; and the fewer and duller the Impressions are, that are made by them; and the duller the Faculties are, that are employed about them, the more remote are they from that Knowledge, which is to be found in some Men. But this being in great variety of Degrees, (as may be perceived amongst Men) cannot certainly be discovered in the several Species of Animals, much less in their particular Individuals. It suffices me only to have remarked here, that Perception is the first Operation of all our intellectual Faculties, and the Inlet of all Knowledge into our Minds. And I am apt too, to imagine, That it is Perception in the lowest degree of it, which puts the Boundaries between Animals, and the inferior ranks of Creatures. But this I mention only as my conjecture by the by, it being indifferent to the matter in Hand, which way the Learned shall determine of it.

CHAP.

# CHAP. X.

## *Of Retention.*

§. 1. THE next Faculty of the Mind, whereby it makes a farther Progreſs towards Knowledge, is that which I call *Retention*, or the keeping of thoſe ſimple *Ideas*, which from Senſation or Reflection it hath received. This is done two ways. Firſt, by keeping the *Idea*, which is brought into it, for ſometime actually in view, which is called *Contemplation.* *Contemplation.*

§. 2. The other way of Retention is the Power to revive again in our Minds thoſe *Ideas*, which after imprinting have diſappeared, or have been as it were laid aſide out of Sight: And thus we do, when we conceive Heat or Light, Yellow or Sweet, the Object being removed. This is *Memory*, which is as it were the Store-houſe of our *Ideas*. For the narrow Mind of Man, not being capable of having many *Ideas* under View and Conſideration at once, it was neceſſary to have a Repoſitory, to lay up thoſe *Ideas*, which at another time it might have uſe of. But our *Ideas* being nothing, but actual Perceptions in the Mind, which ceaſe to be any thing, when there is no Perception of them, this *laying up* of our *Ideas* in the Repoſitory of the Memory, ſignifies no more but this, that the Mind has a Power, in many Caſes, to revive Perceptions, which it has once had, with this additional Perception annexed to them, that it has had them before. And in this Senſe it is, that our *Ideas* are ſaid to be in our Memories, when indeed, they are actually no where, but only there is an ability in the Mind, when it will, to revive them again; and as it were pain them anew on it ſelf, though ſome with more, ſome with leſs difficulty; ſome more lively, and others more obſcurely. And thus it is, by the Aſſiſtance of this Faculty, what we are ſaid to have all thoſe *Ideas* in our Underſtandings, which though we do not actually contemplate, yet we can bring in ſight, and make appear again, and be the Objects of our Thoughts, without the help of thoſe ſenſible Qualities, which firſt imprinted them there. *Memory.*

§. 3.

*Attention, Repetition, Pleasure, and Pain fix* Ideas.

§. 3. *Attention* and *Repetition help* much to the fixing any *Ideas* in *the Memory*: But those, which naturally at first make the deepest, and most lasting Impression, are those, which are accompanied with *Pleasure* or *Pain*. The great Business of the Senses, being to make us take notice of what hurts, or advantages the Body, it is wisely ordered by Nature (as has been shewn) that Pain should accompany the Reception of several *Ideas*; which supplying the Place of Consideration and Reasoning in Children, and acting quicker than Consideration in grown Men, makes both the Young and Old avoid painful Objects, with that haste, which is necessary for their Preservation; and in both settles in the Memory a caution for the Future.

Ideas *fade in the Memory.*

§. 4. Concerning the several *degrees of* lasting, wherewith *Ideas* are imprinted on the *Memory*, we may observe, That some of them have been produced in the Understanding, by an Object affecting the Senses once only, and no more than once: Others, that have more than once offer'd themselves to the Senses, have yet been little taken notice of; the Mind, either heedless, as in Children, or otherwise employ'd, as in Men, intend only on one thing, not setting the stamp deep into it self. And in some, where they are set on with care and repeated impressions, either through the temper of the Body, or some other default, the Memory is very weak: In all these cases, *Ideas* in the Mind quickly fade, and often vanish quite out of the Understanding, leaving no more foot-steps, or remaining Characters of themselves, than Shadows do flying over Fields of Corn; and the Mind is as void of them, as if they never had been there.

§. 5. Thus many of those *Ideas*, which were produced in the Minds of Children, in the beginning of their Sensation (some of which, perhaps, as of some Pleasures and Pains, were before they were born, and others in their Infancy) if in the future Course of their Lives, they are not repeated again, are quite lost, without the least glimpse remaining of them. This may be observed in those, who by some Mischance have lost their sight, when they were very Young, in whom the *Ideas* of Colours, having been but slightly taken notice of, and ceasing to be repeated, do quite wear out; so that some years after, there is no more Notion, nor Memory of Colours left in their Minds, than in those of People born blind. The Memory in some Men, 'tis true, is very tenacious, even to a Miracle: But yet there seems

seems to be a constant decay of all our *Ideas*, even of those which are struck deepest, and in Minds the most retentive; so that if they be not sometimes renewed by repeated Exercise of the Senses, or Reflection on those kind of Objects, which at first occasioned them, the Print wears out, and at last there remains nothing to be seen. Thus the *Ideas*, as well as Children, of our Youth, often die before us: And our Minds represent to us those Tombs, to which we are approaching; where though the Brass and Marble remain, yet the Inscriptions are effaced by time, and the Imagery moulders away. *The Pictures drawn in our Minds, are laid in fading Colours*; and if not sometimes refreshed, vanish and disappear. How much the Constitution of our Bodies, and the make of our animal Spirits, are concerned in this, and whether the Temper of the Brain make this difference, that in some it retains the Characters drawn on it like Marble, in others like Free-stone, and in others little better then Sand, I shall not here enquire, though it may seem probable, that the Constitution of the Body does sometimes influence the Memory; since we oftentimes find a Disease quite strip the Mind of all its *Ideas*, and the flames of a Fever, in a few Days, calcine all those Images to dust and confusion, which seem'd to be as lasting, as if graved in Marble.

*Constantly repeated* Ideas *can scarce be lost.*

§. 6. But concerning the *Ideas* themselves, it is easie to remark, That those that are *oftenest refreshed* (amongst which are those that are conveyed into the Mind by more ways than one) by a frequent return of the Objects or Actions that produce them, *fix themselves best in the Memory*, and remain clearest and longest there; and therefore those, which are of the original Qualities of Bodies, *viz. Solidity, Extension, Figure, Motion*, and *Rest*, and those that almost constantly affect our Bodies, as *Heat* and *Cold*; and those which are the Affections of all kinds of Beings, as *Existence, Duration*, and *Number*, which almost every Object that affects our Senses, every Thought which imploys our Minds, bring along with them: These, I say, and the like *Ideas*, are seldom quite lost, whilst the Mind retains any *Ideas* at all.

*In remembring the Mind is often active.*

§. 7. In this secondary Perception, as I may so call it, or viewing again the *Ideas*, that are lodg'd *in* the *Memory*, *the Mind is oftentimes more than barely passive*, the appearance of those dormant Pictures, Depending sometimes on the Will. The Mind very often sets it self on work in search of some hidden

*Idea*, and turns, as it were, the Eye of the Soul upon it; though sometimes too they start up in our Minds of their own accord, and offer themselves to the Understanding; and very often are rouzed and tumbled out of their dark Cells, into open Daylight, by some turbulent and tempestuous Passion; our Affections bringing *Ideas* to our Memory, which had otherwise lain quiet and unregarded. This farther is to be observed, concerning *Ideas* lodg'd in the Memory, and upon occasion revived by the Mind, that they are not only (as the Word *revive* imports) none of them new ones; but also that the Mind takes notice of them, as of a former Impression, and renews its acquaintance with them, as with *Ideas* it had known before. So that though *Ideas* formerly imprinted, are not all constantly in view, yet in remembrance they are constantly known to be such, as have been formerly imprinted, *i. e.* in view, and taken notice of before by the Understanding.

*Two defects in the Memory, Oblivion and Slowness.*

§. 8. *Memory*, in an intellectual Creature, is necessary in the next degree to Perception. It is of so great moment, that where it is wanting, all the rest of our Faculties are in a great measure useless: And we in our Thoughts, Reasonings, and Knowledge, could not proceed beyond present Objects, were it not for the assistance of our Memories, wherein there may be *two defects*.

*First*, That it *loses the Idea* quite, and so far it produces perfect Ignorance. For since we can know nothing farther, than we have the *Idea* of it, when that is gone, we are in perfect *Ignorance*.

*Secondly*, That it moves slowly, and *retrieves not the Ideas*, that it has, and are laid up in store, *quick enough* to serve the Mind upon occasions. This, if it be to a great degree, is *Stupidity*; and he, who through this default in his Memory, has not the *Ideas*, that are really preserved there, ready at hand, when need and occasion calls for them, were almost as good be without them quite, since they serve him to little purpose. The dull Man, who loses the opportunity, whilst he is seeking in his Mind for those *Ideas*, that should serve his turn, is not much more happy in his Knowledge, than one that is perfectly ignorant. 'Tis the business therefore of the Memory to furnish to the Mind those dormant *Ideas*, which it has present occasion for, in the having them ready at hand on all occasions, consists that which we call *Invention*, *Fancy*, and quickness of Parts.

§. 9.

§. 9. These are defects, we may observe, in the Memory of one Man compared with another. There is another defect, which we may conceive to be in the memory of Man in general, compared with some superiour created intellectual Beings, which in this faculty may so far excel Man, that they may have constantly in view the whole sense of all their former actions, wherein no one of the thoughts they have ever had, may slip out of their sight. The Omniscience of God, who knows all things past, present, and to come, and to whom the thoughts of Men's hearts always lie open, may satisfie us of the possibility of this. For who can doubt, but God may communicate to those glorious Spirits, his immediate Attendants, any of his Perfections, in what proportion he pleases, as far as created finite Beings can be capable. 'Tis reported of that prodigy of Parts, Monsieur *Pascal*, that, till the decay of his health had impaired his Memory, he forgot nothing of what he had done, read, or thought in any part of his rational Age. This is a privilege so little known to most Men, that it seems almost incredible to those, who, after the ordinary way, measure all others by themselves: But yet when considered, may help us to enlarge our thoughts towards greater perfections of it in superior ranks of spirits. For this of Mr. *Pascal* was still with the narrowness, that humane Minds are confin'd to here, of having great variety of *Ideas* only by succession, not all at once: Whereas the several degrees of Angels may probably have larger views, and some of them be endowed with capacities able to retain together, and constantly set before them, as in one Picture, all their past knowledge at once. This, we may conceive, would be no small advantage to the knowledge of a thinking Man; if all his past thoughts, and reasonings could be always present to him. And therefore we may suppose it one of those ways, wherein the knowledge of separate Spirits may exceedingly surpass ours.

*Brutes have Memory.*

§. 10. This faculty of laying up, and retaining the *Ideas*, that are brought into the Mind, several *other Animals* seem to have, to a great degree, as well as Man. For to pass by other Instances, Birds learning of Tunes, and the endeavours one may observe in them, to hit the Notes right, put it past doubt with me, that they have Perception, and retain *Ideas* in their Memories, and use them for Patterns. For it seems to me impossible, that they should endeavour to conform their Voices to Notes (as 'tis plain they do) of which they had no *Ideas*. For though I should grant

Sound may mechanically cause a certain motion of the animal Spirits, in the Brains of those Birds, whilst the Tune is actually playing; and that motion may be continued on to the Muscles of the Wings, and so the Bird mechanically be driven away by certain noises, because this may tend to the Bird's Preservation: Yet that can never be supposed a Reason, why it should cause mechanically, either whilst the Tune was playing, much less after it has ceased, such a motion in the Organs of the Bird's Voice, as should conform it to the Notes of a foreign Sound, which imitation can be of no use to the Bird's Preservation. But which is more, it cannot with any appearance of Reason, be supposed (much less proved) that Birds, without Sense and Memory, can approach their Notes, nearer and nearer by degrees, to a Tune play'd yesterday; which if they have no *Idea* of in their Memory, is now no-where, nor can be a Pattern for them to imitate, or which any repeated Essays can bring them nearer to. Since there is no reason why the sound of a Pipe should leave traces in their Brains, which not at first, but by their after-endeavours, should produce the like Sounds; and why the Sounds they make themselves, should not make traces which they should follow, as well as those of the Pipe, is impossible to conceive.

## CHAP. XI.

### *Of Discerning, and other Operations of the Mind.*

*No Knowledge without it.*

§. 1. ANother Faculty, we may take notice of in our Minds, is that of *Discerning* and distinguishing between the several *Ideas* it has. It is not enough to have a confused Perception of something in general: Unless the Mind had a distinct Perception of different Objects, and their Qualities, it would be capable of very little Knowledge; though the Bodies that affect us, were as busie about us, as they are now, and the Mind were continually employ'd in thinking. On this faculty of Distinguishing one thing from another, depends the *evidence and certainty* of several, even very general Propositions, which have passed for innate Truths; because Men over-looking the true cause, why those Propositions find universal Assent, impute it

it wholly to native uniform Impressions; whereas it in truth *depends upon this clear discerning Faculty* of the Mind, whereby it perceives two *Ideas* to be the same, or different. But of this more hereafter.

*The difference of Wit and Judgment.*

§. 2. How much the imperfection of accurately discriminating *Ideas* one from another lies, either in the dulness, or faults of the Organs of Sense; or want of acuteness, exercise, or attention in the Understanding; or hastiness and precipitancy, natural to some Tempers, I will not here examine: It suffices to take notice, that this is one of the Operations that the Mind may reflect on, and observe in it self. It is of that consequence to its other Knowledge, that so far as this faculty is in it self dull, or not rightly made use of, for the distinguishing one thing from another; so far our Notions are confused, and our Reason and Judgment disturbed or misled. If in having our *Ideas* in the Memory ready at hand, consists quickness of parts; in this of having them unconfused, and being able nicely to distinguish one thing from another, where there is but the least difference, consists, in a great measure, the exactness of Judgment, and clearness of Reason, which is to be observed in one Man above another. And hence, perhaps, may be given some Reason of that common Observation, That Men who have a great deal of Wit, and prompt Memories, have not always the clearest Judgment, or deepest Reason. For *Wit* lying most in the assemblage of *Ideas*, and putting those together with quickness and variety, wherein can be found any resemblance or congruity, thereby to make up pleasant Pictures, and agreeable Visions in the Fancy: *Judgment*, on the contrary, lies quite on the other side, in separating carefully, one from another, *Ideas*, wherein can be found the least difference, thereby to avoid being misled by Similitude, and by affinity to take one thing for another. This is a way of proceeding quite contrary to Metaphor and Allusion, wherein for the most part, lies that entertainment and pleasantry of Wit, which strikes so lively on the Fancy, and therefore so acceptable to all People; because its Beauty appears at first sight, and there is required no labour of thought, to examine what Truth or Reason there is in it. The Mind without looking any farther, rests satisfied with the agreeableness of the Picture, and the gayety of the Fancy: And it is a kind of an affront to go about to examine it, by the severe Rules of Truth, and good Reason; whereby it appears, that it consists in something, that is not perfectly conformable to them.

*Clearness alone hinders Confusion.*

§. 3. To the well distinguishing our *Ideas*, it chiefly contributes, they be *clear and determinate*: And when they are so, *it will not breed any confusion* or mistake about them, though the Senses should (as sometimes they do) convey them from the same Object differently, on different occasions, and so seem to err. For though a Man in a Fever should from Sugar have a bitter taste, which at another time would produce a sweet one; yet the *Idea* of Bitter in that Man's Mind, would be as clear and distinct from the *Idea* of Sweet, as if he had tasted only Gall. Nor does it make any more confusion between the two *Ideas* of Sweet and Bitter, that the same sort of Body produces at one time one, and at another time another *Idea*, by the taste, than it makes a confusion in two *Ideas* of White and Sweet, or White and Round, that the same piece of Sugar produces them both in the Mind at the same time. And the *Ideas* of Orange-colour and Azure, that are produced in the Mind by the same parcel of the infusion of *Lignum Nephriticum*, are no less distinct *Ideas*, than those of the same Colours, taken from two very different Bodies.

*Comparing.*

§. 4. The *COMPARING* them one with another, in respect of Extent, Degrees, Time, Place, or any other Circumstances, is another operation of the Mind about its *Ideas*, and is that upon which depends all that large tribe of *Ideas*, comprehended under *Relation*; which of how vast an extent it is, I shall have occasion to consider hereafter.

*Brutes compare, but imperfectly.*

§. 5. How far Brutes partake in this faculty, is not easie to determine; I imagine they have it not in any great degree: For though they probably have several *Ideas* distinct enough, yet it seems to me to be the Prerogative of Humane Understanding, when it has sufficiently distinguished any *Ideas*, so as to perceive them to be perfectly different, and so consequently two, to cast about and consider in what circumstances they are capable to be compared. And therefore, I think, *Beasts compare* not their *Ideas*, farther than some sensible Circumstances annexed to the Objects themselves. The other power of Comparing, which may be observed in Men belonging to general *Ideas*, and useful only to abstract Reasonings, we may probably conjecture Beasts have not.

*Compounding.*

§. 6. The next Operation we may observe in the Mind about its *Ideas*, is *COMPOSITION*; whereby

whereby it puts together several of those simple ones it has received from Sensation and Reflection, and combines them into complex ones. Under this of Composition, may be reckon'd also that of *ENLARGING*; wherein though the Composition does not so much appear as in more complex ones, yet it is nevertheless a putting several *Ideas* together, though of the same kind. Thus by adding several Unites together, we make the *Idea* of a Dozen; and putting together the repeated *Ideas* of several Perches, we frame that of Furlong.

*Brutes compound but little.*

§. 7. In this also, I suppose, *Brutes* come far short of Men. For though they take in, and retain together several Combinations or simple *Ideas*, as possibly the Shape, Smell, and Voice of his Master, make up the complex *Idea* a Dog has of him; or rather are so many distinct Marks whereby he knows him: yet, I *do not* think they do of themselves ever compound them, and *make complex* Ideas. And perhaps even where we think they have complex *Ideas*, 'tis only one simple one that directs them in the knowledge of several things, which possibly they distinguish less by their Sight, than we imagine. For I have been credibly informed, that a Bitch will nurse, play with, and be fond of young Foxes, as much as, and in place of her Puppies, if you can but get them once to suck her so long, that her Milk may go through them. And those Animals which have a numerous brood of young ones at once, appear not to have any knowledge of their number; for though they are mightily concerned for any of their young, that are taken from them whilst they are in sight or hearing, yet if one or two of them be stollen from them in their absence, or without noise, they appear not to miss them; or to have any sense, that their number is less'n'd.

*Naming.*

§. 8. When Children have, by repeated Sensations, got *Ideas* fixed in their Memories, they begin, by degrees, to learn the use of Signs. And when they have got the skill to apply the Organs of Speech to the framing of articulate Sounds, they begin to make *Use of Words*, to signifie their *Ideas* to other: These verbal Signs they sometimes borrow from others, and sometimes make themselves, as one may observe among the new and unusual Names Children often give to things in their first use of Language.

*Abstraction.*

§. 9. The use of Words then being to stand as outward Marks of our internal *Ideas*, and those *Ideas* being taken from particular things, if every particular *Idea*

that we take in, should have a distinct Name, Names must be endless. To prevent this, the Mind makes the particular *Ideas*, received from particular Objects, to become general; which is done by considering them as they are in the Mind such Appearances, separate from all other Existences, and the circumstances of real Existence, as Time, Place, or any other concomitant *Ideas*. This is called *ABSTRACTION*, whereby *Ideas* taken from particular Beings, become general Representatives of all of the same kind; and their Names general Names, applicable to whatever exists conformable to such abstract *Ideas*. Such precise, naked Appearances in the Mind, without considering, how, whence, or with what others they came there, the Understanding lays up (with Names commonly annexed to them) as the Standards to rank real Existences into sorts, as they agree with these Patterns, and to *denominate* them accordingly. Thus the same Colour being observed to day in Chalk or Snow, which the Mind yesterday received from Milk, it considers that Appearance alone, makes it a representative of all of that kind; and having given it the name *Whiteness*, it by that sound signifies the same quality whereso'ever to be imagin'd or met with; and thus Universals whether *Ideas* or Terms, are made.

*Brutes abstract not.*

§. 10. If it may be doubted, whether *Beasts* compound and enlarge their *Ideas* that way, to any degree: This, I think, I may be positive in, That the power of *Abstracting* is not at all in them; and that the having of general *Ideas*, is that which puts a perfect distinction betwixt Man and Brutes; and is an Excellency which the Faculties of Brutes do by no means attain to. For it is evident, we observe no foot-steps in them, of making use of general signs for universal *Ideas*; from which we have reason to imagine, that they have not the faculty of abstracting, or making general *Ideas*, since they have no use of Words, or any other general Signs.

§. 11. Nor can it be imputed to their want of fit Organs, to frame articulate Sounds that they have no use, or knowledge of general Words; since many of them, we find, can fashion such Sounds, and pronounce Words distinctly enough, but never with any such application. And on the other side, Men, who through some defect in the Organs, want words, yet fail not to express their universal *Ideas* by signs, which serve them instead of general words; a faculty which we see Beasts come short in. And therefore I think we may suppose, that 'tis in this, that the Species of *Brutes* are discriminated from Man;

and

and 'tis that proper difference wherein they are wholly separated, and which at last widens to so vast a distance. For if they have any *Ideas* at all, and are not bare Machins (as some would have them) we cannot deny them to have some Reason. It seems as evident to me, that they do some of them in certain Instances reason, as that they have sense; but it is only in particular *Ideas*, just as they receiv'd them from their Senses. They are the best of them tied up within those narrow bounds, and *have not* (as I think) the faculty to enlarge them by any kind of *Abstraction*.

*Idiots and mad Men.*

§. 12. How far *Idiots* are concerned in the want or weakness of any, or all of the foregoing Faculties, an exact observation of their several ways of faltering, would no doubt discover. For those who either perceive but dully, or retain the *Ideas* that come into their Minds but ill, who cannot readily excite or compound them, will have little matter to think on. Those who cannot distinguish, compare, and abstract, would hardly be able to understand, and make use of Language, or judge, or reason, to any tolerable degree: But only a little, and imperfectly, about things present, and very familiar to their Senses. And indeed, any of the forementioned Faculties, if wanting, or out of order, produce suitable defects in Men's Understandings and Knowledge.

§. 13. In fine, the defect in *Naturals* seems to proceed from want of quickness, activity, and motion, in the intellectual Faculties, whereby they are deprived of Reason: Whereas *mad Men*, on the other side, seem to suffer by the other extreme. For they do not appear to me to have lost the Faculty of Reasoning: But having joined together some *Ideas* very wrongly, they mistake them for Truths; and they err as Men do that argue right from wrong Principles. For by the violence of their Imaginations, having taken their Fancies for Realities, they make right deductions from them. Thus you shall find a distracted Man fancying himself a King, with a right inference, require suitable Attendance, Respect, and Obedience: Others who have thought themselves made of Glass, have used the caution necessary to preserve such brittle Bodies. Hence it comes to pass, that a Man, who is very sober, and of a right Understanding in all other things, may in one particular be as frantick, as any in *Bedlam*; if either by any sudden very strong impression, or long fixing his Fancy upon one sort of Thoughts, incoherent *Ideas* have been cemented together so powerfully, as to remain

united.

united. But there are degrees of Madness, as of Folly; the disorderly jumbling *Ideas* together, is in some more, and some less. In short, herein seems to lie the difference between Idiots and mad Men, That mad Men put wrong *Ideas* together, and so make wrong Propositions, but argue and reason right from them: But Idiots make very few or no Propositions, and reason scarce at all.

*Method.*

§. 14. These I think, are the first Faculties and Operations of the Mind, which it makes use of in Understanding; and though they are exercised about all its *Ideas* in general; yet the Instances, I have hitherto given, have been chiefly in simple *Ideas*; and I have subjoined the explication of these Faculties of the Mind, to that of simple *Ideas*, before I come to what I have to say, concerning complex ones, for these following Reasons:

*First*, Because several of these Faculties being exercised at first principally about simple *Ideas*, we might, by following Nature in its ordinary method, trace and discover them in their rise, progress, and gradual improvements.

*Secondly*, Because observing the Faculties of the Mind, how they operate about simple *Ideas*, which are usually in most Men's Minds much more clear, precise, and distinct, than complex ones, we may the better examine and learn how the Mind abstracts, denominates, compares, and exercises its other Operations, about those which are complex, wherein we are much more liable to mistake.

*Thirdly*, Because these very Operations of the Mind about *Ideas*, receiv'd from *Sensation*, are themselves, when reflected on, another sett of *Ideas*, derived from that other source of our Knowledge which I call *Reflection*; and therefore fit to be considered in this place, after the simple *Ideas* of *Sensation*. Of Compounding, Comparing, Abstracting, &c. I have but just spoken, having Occasion to treat of them more at large in other places.

*These are the Beginnings of humane Knowledge.*

§. 15. And thus I have given a short, and, I think, true *History of the first beginnings of Humane Knowledge*; whence the Mind has its first Objects, and by what steps it makes its Progress to the laying in, and storing up those *Ideas*, out of which is to be framed all the Knowledge it is capable of; wherein I must appeal to Experience and Observation, whether I am in the right: The best way to come to Truth, being

ing to examine Things as really they are, and not to conclude they are, as we fancy of our selves, or have been taught by others to imagine.

§. 16. To deal truly, *this is the only way*, that I can discover, *whereby* the *Ideas* of things *are brought into the Understanding*: If other Men have either innate *Ideas*, or infused Principles, they have reason to enjoy them; and if they are sure of it, it is impossible for others to deny them the Priviledge that they have about their Neighbours. I can speak but of what I find in my self, and is agreeable to those Notions; which, if we will examine the whole course of Men in their several Ages, Countries, and Educations, seem to depend on those Foundations which I have laid, and to correspond with this Method, in all the Parts and Degrees thereof. *Appeal to Experience.*

§. 17. I pretend not to teach, but to enquire; and therefore cannot but confess here again, That external and internal Sensation, are the only passages that I can find, of Knowledge, to the Understanding. These alone, as far as I can discover, are the Windows by which Light is let into this *dark Room*. For, methinks, the *Understanding* is not much unlike a Closet wholly shut from light, with only some little opening left, to let in external visible Resemblances, or *Ideas* of things without; would the Pictures coming into such a dark Room but stay there, and lie so orderly as to be found upon occasion, it would very much resemble the Understanding of a Man, in reference to all Objects of sight, and the *Ideas* of them. *Dark room.*

These are my Guesses concerning the means whereby the Understanding comes to have, and retain simple *Ideas*, and the modes of them, with some other operations about them. I proceed now to examine some of these simple *Ideas* and their Modes, a little more particularly.

## CHAP. XII.

### *Of Complex* IDEAS.

§. 1. WE have hitherto considerred those *Ideas*, in the reception whereof, the Mind is only passive, which are those simple ones received *Made by the Mind out of simple ones.*

received from *Sensation* and *Reflection* before-mentioned, whereof the Mind cannot make one to it self, nor have any *Idea* which does not wholly consist of them. But as the Mind is wholly Passive in the reception of all its simple *Ideas*, so it exerts several acts of its own, whereby out of its simple *Ideas*, as the Materials and Foundations of the rest, the other are framed. The Acts of the Mind wherein it exerts its Power over its simple *Ideas*, are chiefly these three, 1. Combining several simple *Ideas* into one compound one, and thus all Complex *Ideas* are made. 2. The 2*d*. is bringing two *Ideas*, whether simple or complex, together; and setting them by one another, so as to take a view of them at once, without uniting them into one; by which way it gets all its *Ideas* of Relations. 3. The 3*d*. is separating them from all other *Ideas* that accompany them in their real existence; this is called *Abstraction*: And thus all its General *Ideas* are made. This shews Man's Power, and its way of Operation, to be much what the same in the Material an Intellectual Word. For the Materials in both being such as he has no power over, either to make or destroy, all that Man can do, is either to unite them together, or to set them by one another, or wholly separate them. I shall here begin with the first of these in the consideration of Complex *Ideas*, and come to the other two in their due places. As simple *Ideas* are observed to exist in several Combinations united together; so the Mind has a power to consider several of them united together, as one *Idea*; and that not only as they are united in external Objects, but as it self has join'd them. *Ideas* thus made up of several simple ones put together, I call *Complex*; such as are *Beauty*, *Gratitude*, *a Man*, *an Army*, *the Universe*; which though complicated of various simple *Ideas*, or *complex Ideas* made up of simple ones, yet are, when the Mind pleases, considered each by it self, as one entire thing, and signified by one Name.

*Made voluntarily.*

§. 2. In this faculty of repeating and joining together its *Ideas*, the Mind has great power in varying and multiplying the Objects of its Thoughts, infinitely beyond what *Sensation* or *Reflection* furnished it with: But all This still confined to those simple *Ideas*, which it received from those two Sources, and which are the ultimate Materials of all its Compositions. For simple *Ideas* are all from things themselves; and of these *the Mind can* have no more, nor other than what are suggested to it. It can have no other *Ideas* of sensible Qualities than what come from without by the Senses, nor any *Ideas* of other kind of Operations of a thinking

thinking Substance, than what it finds in it self: But when it has once got these simple *Ideas*, it is not confined barely to Observation, and what offers it self from without; it can, by its own power, put together those *Ideas* it has, and *make new Complex ones*, which it never received so united.

*Are either Modes, Substances, or Relations.*

§. 3. *Complex Ideas*, however compounded and decompounded, though their number be infinite, and the variety endless, wherewith they fill, and entertain the Thoughts of Men; yet, I think, they may be all reduced under these three Heads.

1. *Modes.*
2. *Substances.*
3. *Relations.*

*Modes.*

§. 4. First, *Modes* I call such complex *Ideas*, which however compounded, contain not in them the supposition of subsisting by themselves, but are considered as Dependences on, or Affections of Substances; such are the *Ideas* signified by the Words *Triangle*, *Gratitude*, *Murther*, *&c.* And if in this I use the word *Mode*, in somewhat a different sense from its ordinary signification, I beg pardon; it being unavoidable in Discourses, differing from the ordinary received Notions, either to make new Words, or to use old Words in somewhat a new signification, the latter whereof, in our present case, is perhaps the more tolerable of the two.

*Simple and mixed Modes.*

§. 5. Of these *Modes*, there are two sorts, which deserve distinct consideration. First, There are some which are only variations, or different combinations of the same simple *Idea*, without the mixture of any other, as a dozen, or score; which are nothing but the *Ideas* of so many distinct Unites added together, and these I call *simple Modes*, as being contained within the bounds of one simple *Idea*. Secondly, There are others compounded of simple *Ideas*, of several kinds, put together to make one complex one; *v. g. Beauty*, consisting of a certain Composition of Colour and Figure, causing Delight in the Beholder; *Theft*, which being the concealed Change of the Possession of any thing, without the Consent of the Proprietor, contains, as is visible, a Combination of several *Ideas* of several kinds; and these I call *mixed Modes.*

*Substances single or collective.*

§. 6. Secondly, The *Ideas* of *Substances* are such Combinations of simple *Ideas*, as are taken to represent distinct particular things subsisting by themselves;

themſelves; in which the ſuppoſed, or confuſed *Idea* of Subſtance, ſuch as it is, is always the firſt and chief. Thus, if to Subſtance be joined the ſimple *Idea* of a certain dull whitiſh Colour, with certain degrees of Weight, Hardneſs, Ductility and Fuſibility, we have the *Idea* of *Lead*; and a Combination of the *Ideas* of a certain ſort of Figure, with the Powers of Motion, Thought, and Reaſoning, joined to Subſtance, make the ordinary *Idea* of *a Man*. Now, of Subſtances alſo, there are two ſorts of *Ideas*; one of ſingle Subſtances, as they exiſt ſeparately, as of *a Man*, or *a Sheep*; the other of ſeveral of thoſe put together, as an *Army* of Men, or *Flock* of Sheep; which *collective* Ideas *of* ſeveral *Subſtances* thus put together, are as much each of them one ſingle *Idea*, as that of a Man, or an Unite.

*Relation.* §. 7. Thirdly, The laſt ſort of complex *Ideas*, is that we call *Relation*, which conſiſts in the Conſideration, and comparing one *Idea* with another: Of theſe ſeveral kinds, we ſhall treat in their order.

*The abſtruſeſt Ideas from the two Sources.* §. 8. If we will trace the Progreſs of our Minds, and with Attention obſerve how it repeats, adds together, and unites its ſimple *Ideas* received from Senſation or Reflection, it will lead us farther than at firſt, perhaps, we ſhould have imagined. And, I believe, we ſhall find, if we warily obſerve the Originals of our Notions, that even *the moſt abſtruſe* Ideas, how remote ſoever they may ſeem from Senſe, or from any Operation of our own Minds, are yet only ſuch as the Underſtanding frames to it ſelf, by repeating and joining together *Ideas*, that it had either from Objects of Senſe, or from its own Operations about them: So that thoſe even large *and abſtract* Ideas, *are derived from Senſation, or Reflection*, being no other than what the Mind, by the ordinary Uſe of its own Faculties, employed about *Ideas* received from Objects of Senſe, or from the Operations it obſerves in it ſelf about them, may, and does attain unto. This I ſhall endeavour to ſhew in the *Ideas* we have of *Space*, *Time*, and *Infinity*, and ſome few other, that ſeem the moſt remote from thoſe Originals.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XIII.

## *Of Simple Modes; and first, of the Simple Modes of Space.*

§. 1. THough in the foregoing part, I have often mentioned ſimple *Ideas*, which are truly the Materials of all our Knowledge; yet having treated of them there, rather in the way that they come into the Mind, than as diſtinguiſhed from others more compounded, it will not be, perhaps, amiſs to take a View of ſome of them again under this Conſideration, and examine thoſe different *Modifications of the ſame* Idea; which the Mind either finds in things exiſting, or is able to make within it ſelf, without the help of any extrinſical Object, or any foreign Suggeſtion. *Simple Modes.*

Thoſe *Modifications of any one ſimple* Idea, (which as has been ſaid I call *ſimple Modes*) are as perfectly different and diſtinct *Ideas* in the Mind, as thoſe of the greateſt Diſtance or Contrariety. For the *Idea* of *Two*, is as diſtinct from that of *One*, as *Blueneſs* from *Heat*, or either of them from any Number: And yet it is made up only of that ſimple *Idea* of an Unite repeated; and Repetitions of this kind joined together, make thoſe diſtinct *ſimple Modes*, of a *Dozen*, a *Groſs*, a *Million*.

§. 2. I ſhall begin with the *ſimple Idea* of *Space*. I have ſhewed above, *c.* 4. that we get the *Idea* of Space, both by our Sight, and Touch; which I think, is ſo evident, that it would be as needleſs, to go to prove, that Men perceive, by their Sight, a Diſtance between Bodies of different Colours, or between the parts of the ſame Body; as that they ſee Colours themſelves: Nor is it leſs obvious, that they can do ſo in the Dark by Feeling and Touch. Idea *of Space.*

§. 3. This Space conſidered barely in Length between any two Beings, without conſidering any thing elſe between them, is called *Diſtance*: If conſidered in Length, Breadth, and Thickneſs, I think it may be called *Capacity*: The Term Extenſion, is uſually applied to it in what manner ſoever conſidered. *Space and Extenſion.*

§. 4. Each different Diſtance, is a different Modification of Space, and *each* Idea *of any different* *Immenſity.*

*Diſtance,*

*Distance, or Space, is a simple Mode of this* Idea. Men for the Use, and by the Custom of Measuring, settle in their Minds the *Ideas* of certain stated Lengths, such as are an *Inch, Foot, Yard, Fathom, Mile Diameter of the Earth*, &c. which are so many distinct *Ideas* made up only of Space. When any such stated Lengths or Measures of Space are made familiar to Men's Thoughts, they can in their Minds, repeat them as often as they will, without mixing or joining to them the *Idea* of Body, or any thing else; and frame to themselves the *Ideas* of long, square, or cubick, *Feet, Yard*, or *Fathoms*, here amongst the Bodies of the Universe, or else beyond the utmost Bounds of all Bodies; and by adding these still one to another, enlarge their *Idea* of Space as much as they please. This Power of repeating, or doubling any *Idea* we have of any Distance, and adding it to the former as often as we will, without being ever able to come to any stop or stint, let us enlarge it as much as we will, is that, which gives us the *Idea* of *Immensity*.

*Figure.* §. 5. There is another Modification of this *Idea*, which is nothing but the Relation which the Parts of the Termination of Extension, or circumscribed Space, have amongst themselves. This the Touch discovers in sensible Bodies, whose Extremities come within our reach; and the Eye takes both from Bodies and Colours, whose Boundaries are within its View: Where observing how the Extremities terminate either in streight Lines, which meet at discernible Angles; or in crooked Lines, wherein no Angles can be perceived, by considering these as they relate to one another, in all Parts of the Extremities of any Body or Space, it has that *Idea* we call *Figure*, which affords to the Mind infinite Variety. For besides the vast Number of different Figures, that do really exist in the co-herent Masses of Matter, the Stock that the Mind has in its Power, by varying the *Idea* of Space; and thereby making still new Compositions, by repeating its own *Ideas*, and joining them as it pleases, is perfectly inexhaustible: And so it can multiply Figures *in infinitum*.

*Figure.* §. 6. For the Mind having a Power to repeat the *Idea* of any Length directly stretched out, and join it to another in the same Direction, which is to double the Length of that streight Line, or else join it to another with what Inclination it thinks fit, and so make what sort of Angle it pleases: And being able also to shorten any Line it imagines, by taking from it one half, or one fourth, or what part it pleases, without being able to come to an end of any

any such Divisions, it can make an Angle of any Bigness: So also the Lines that are its Sides, of what Length it pleases, which joining again to other Lines of different Lengths, and at different Angles, 'till it has wholly inclosed any Space, it is evident, that it can multiply *Figures* both in their Shape, and Capacity, *in infinitum*; all which are but so many different *simple Modes of Space.*

The same that it can do with streight Lines, it can do also with crooked, or crooked and streight together; and the same it can do in Lines, it can also in Superficies, by which we may be led into farther Thoughts of the endless Variety of *Figures*, that the Mind has a Power to make, and thereby to multiply the *simple Modes* of Space.

*Place.*

§. 7. Another *Idea* coming under this Head, and belonging to this Tribe, is that we call *Place.* As in simple Space, we consider the Relation of Distance between any two Bodies, or Points; so in our *Idea* of *Place*, we consider the Relation of Distance betwixt any thing, and any two or more Points, which are considered, as keeping the same Distance one with another, and so considered as at rest; for when we find any thing at the same Distance now, which it was yesterday from any two or more Points, which have not since changed their Distance one with another, and with which we then compared it, we say it hath kept the same *Place*: But if it hath sensibly altered its Distance with either of those Points, we say it hath changed its Place: Though vulgary speaking in the common Notion of *Place*, we do not always exactly observe the Distance from precise Points; but from large Portions of sensible Objects, to which we consider the thing placed to bear Relation, and its Distance from which we have some Reason to observe.

§. 8. Thus a Company of Chess-men standing on the same Squares of the Chess-board, where we left them, we say they are all in the *same Place*, or unmoved; though, perhaps, the Chess-board hath been in the mean time carried out of one Room into another, because we compared them only to the Parts of the Chess-board, which keep the same Distance one with another. The Chess-board, we also say, is in the *same Place* it was, if it remain in the same part of the Cabin, tho', perhaps, the Ship which it is in, sails all the while: And the Ship is said to be in the *same Place*, supposing it kept the same Distance with the Parts of the neighbouring Land; though, perhaps, the Earth hath turned round; and so both Chess-men, and Board,

and Ship, have every one *changed Place*, in respect of remoter Bodies, which have kept the same Distance one with another. But yet the Distance from certain Parts of the Board, being that which determines the Place of the Chess-men; and the Distance from the fixed Parts of the Cabin (with which we made the Comparison) being that which determined the Place of the Chess-board, and the fixed Parts of the Earth, that by which we determined the Place of the Ship, these things may be said properly to be in the *same Place*, in those respects: Though their Distance from some other things, which in this Matter we did not consider, being varied, they have undoubtedly *changed Place* in that respect; and we our selves shall think so, when we have occasion to compare them with those other.

§. 9. But this Modification of Distance, we call *Place*, being made by Men, for their common Use, that by it they might be able to design the particular Position of Things, where they had occasion for such Designation, Men consider and determine of this *Place*, by reference to those adjacent things, which best served to their present purpose, without considering other things, which to another purpose, would better *determine the Place* of the same thing. Thus in the Chess-board, the Use of the *Designation of* the *Place* of each Chess-man, being determined only within that chequer'd piece of Wood, 'twould cross that Purpose, to measure it by any thing else: But when these very Chess-Men are put up in a Bag, if any one should ask, where the Black King is, it would be proper to *determine the Place* by the Parts of the Room it was in, and not by the Chess-board; there being another Use of *designing the Place* it is now in, than when in Play it was on the Chess-board, and so must be determined by other Bodies. So if any one should ask, in what place are the Verses, which Report the Story of *Nisus* and *Eurialus*, 'twould be very improper to determine this Place, by saying, they were in such a part of the Earth, or in *Bodley*'s Library: But the right Designation of the Place, would be by the Parts of *Virgil*'s Works; and the proper Answer would be, That these Verses were about the middle of the Ninth Book of his *Æneids*; and that they have been always constantly in the same place ever since *Virgil* was printed: Which is true, though the Book it self hath moved a thousand times, the Use of the *Idea* of Place here, being to know only in what part of the Book that Story is, that so upon occasion, we may know where to find it, and have recourse to it for our Use.

*Place.* §. 10. That our *Idea* of Place is nothing else, but

but such a relative Position of any thing, as I have before mentioned, I think is plain, and will be easily admitted, when we consider, that we can have no *Idea* of the Place of the Universe, though we can of all the Parts of it; because beyond that, we have not the *Idea* of any fixed, distinct, particular Beings, in reference to which we can imagine it to have any relation of Distance; but all beyond it is one uniform Space or Expansion, wherein the Mind finds no Variety, no Marks. For to say, that the World is somewhere, means no more, than that it does exist: This, tho' a Phrase borrowed from Place, signifying only its Existence, not Location; and when one can find out, and frame in his Mind clearly and distinctly the Place of the Universe, he will be able to tell us, whether it moves, or stands still in the undistinguishable *Inane* of infinite Space; though it be true, that the Word Place has sometimes a more confused Sense, and stands for that Space which any Body takes up; and so the Universe is in a Place. The *Idea* therefore of *Place*, we have by the same means that we get the *Idea* of Space, (whereof this is but a particular limited Consideration,) *viz.* by our Sight and Touch; by either of which, we receive into our Minds the *Ideas* of Extension or Distance:

*Extension and Body, not the same.*

§. 11. There are some that would perswade us, that *Body and Extension are the same thing*; who either change the Signification of Words, which I would not suspect them of, they having so severely condemned the Philosophy of others, because it hath been too much placed in the uncertain Meaning, or deceitful Obscurity of doubtful or insignificant Terms. If therefore they mean by *Body and Extension, the same* that other People do, *viz.* by *Body*, something that is solid and extended, whose Parts are separable and movable different ways; and by Extension, only the Space that lies between the Extremities of those solid co-herent Parts, and which is possessed by them, they confound very different *Ideas* one with another. For I appeal to every Man's own Thoughts, whether the *Idea* of Space be not as distinct from that of Solidity, as it is from the *Idea* of Scarlet Colour? 'Tis true, Solidity cannot exist without Extension, neither can Scarlet Colour exist without Extension; but this hinders not, but that they are distinct *Ideas*. Many *Ideas* require others as necessary to their Existence or Conception, which yet are very distinct *Ideas*. Motion can neither be, nor be conceived without Space; and yet Motion is not Space, nor Space Motion: Space can exist without it, and they are very distinct *Ideas*; and so, I

think, are those of Space and Solidity. Solidity is so inseparable an *Idea* from Body, that upon that depends its filling of Space, its Contact, Impulse, and Communication of Motion upon Impulse. And if it be a Reason to prove, that Spirit is different from Body, because Thinking includes not the *Idea* of Extension in it; the same Reason will be as valid, I suppose, to prove, that *Space is not Body*, because it includes not the *Idea* of Solidity in it; *Space* and *Solidity* being *as distinct Ideas*, as Thinking and Extension, and as wholly separable in the Mind one from another. *Body* then and *Extension*, 'tis evident, are two distinct *Ideas*. For,

§. 12. *First*, *Extension* includes no Solidity, nor Resistance to the Motion of *Body*, as Body does.

§. 13. *Secondly*, The Parts of pure Space, are inseparable one from the other; so that the Continuity cannot be separated, neither really, nor mentally. For I demand of any one, to remove any part of it from another, with which it is continued, even so much as in Thought. To divide and separate actually, is, as I think, by removing the Parts one from another, to make two Superficies, where before there was a Continuity: And to divide mentally, is to make in the Mind two Superficies, where before there was a Continuity, and consider them as removed one from the other; which can only be done in things considered by the Mind, as capable of being separated; and by Separation, of acquiring new distinct Superficies, which they then have not, but are capable of: But neither of these ways of Separation, whether real or mental, is, as I think, compatible to pure *Space*.

'Tis true, a Man may consider so much of such a *Space*, as is answerable or commensurate to a Foot, without considering the rest; which is indeed a partial Consideration, but not so much as mental Separation, or Division; since a Man can no more mentally divide, without considering two Superficies, separate one from the other, than he can actually divide, without making two Superficies dis-join'd one from the other: But a partial Consideration, is not separating. A Man may consider Light in the Sun, without its Heat; or Mobility in Body without its Extension, without thinking of their Separation. One is only a partial Consideration, terminating in one alone; and the other is a Consideration of both, as existing separately.

§. 14. *Thirdly*, The Parts of pure *Space*, are immovable, which follows from their Inseparability; *Motion* being nothing but Change of Distance between any two things: But this

cannot

cannot be between Parts that are inseparable; which therefore must needs be at perpetual rest one amongst another.

Thus the determined *Idea* of simple *Space*, distinguishes it plainly and sufficiently from *Body*; since its Parts are inseparable, immovable, and without Resistance to the Motion of Body.

*The Definition of Extension, explains it not.*

§. 15. If any one ask me, *What* this *Space*, I speak of, *is*? I will tell him, when he tells me what his *Extension* is. For to say, as is usually done, that Extension is to have *partes extra partes*, is to say only, That *Extension* is *Extension*: For what am I the better informed in the Nature of *Extension*, when I am told, That *Extension is to have Parts that are extended, exterior to Parts that are extended*, i. e. *Extension* consists of extended Parts? As if one asking, What a Fibre was? I should answer him, That it was a thing made up of several Fibres: Would he hereby be enabled to understand what a Fibre was, better than he did before? Or rather, would he not have Reason to think, that my Design was to make Sport with him, rather than seriously to instruct him?

*Division of Beings into Bodies and Spirits, proves not Space and Body the same.*

§. 16. Those who contend, that *Space and Body are the same*, bring this *Dilemma*. Either this *Space* is something, or nothing; if nothing be between two Bodies, they must necessarily touch; if it be allowed to be something, they ask, whether it be Body or Spirit? To which I answer, by another Question, Who told them, that there was, or could be nothing but solid Beings, which could not think; and thinking Beings that were not extended? Which is all they mean by the Terms, *Body* and *Spirit*.

*Substance which we know not, no Proof against Space without Body.*

§. 17. If it be demanded, (as usually it is) whether this *Space*, void of *Body*, be *Substance* or *Accident*, I shall readily answer, I know not: Nor shall be ashamed to own my Ignorance, 'till they that ask, shew me a clear distinct *Idea* of *Substance*.

§. 18. I endeavour, as much as I can, to deliver my self from those Fallacies which we are apt to put upon our selves, by taking Words for Things. It helps not our Ignorance to feign a Knowledge, where we have none, by making a Noise with Sounds, without clear and distinct Significations. Names made at Pleasure, neither alter the Nature of Things, nor make us understand them, but as they are Signs of, and stand for determined *Ideas*. And I desire those who lay so much Stress on the

Sound of these two Syllables, *Substance*, to consider, whether applying it, as they do, to the infinite incomprehensible GOD, to finite Spirit, and to Body, it be in the same Sense; and whether it stands for the same *Idea*, when each of those three so different Beings are called *Substances*? If so, whether it will not thence follow, That God, Spirits, and Body, agreeing in the same common Nature of *Substance*, differ not any otherwise, than in a bare different Modification of that *Substance*; as a Tree and a Pebble, being in the same Sense Body, and agreeing in the common Nature of Body, differ only in a bare Modification of that common Matter; which will be a very harsh Doctrine. If they say, That they apply it to God, finite Spirits, and Matter, in three different Significations, and that it stands for one *Idea*, when GOD is said to be a *Substance*; for another, when the Soul is called *Substance*; and for a third, when a Body is called so. If the Name *Substance*, stands for three several distinct *Ideas*, they would do well to make known those distinct *Ideas*, or at least to give three distinct Names to them, to prevent in so important a Notion, the Confusion and Errors that will naturally follow from the promiscuous Use of so doubtful a Term; which is so far from being suspected to have three distinct, that in ordinary Use it has scarce one clear distinct Signification: And if they can thus make three distinct *Ideas* of *Substance*, what hinders, why another may not make a fourth?

*Substance and Accidents of little Use in Philosophy.*

§. 19. They who first ran into the Notion of *Accidents*, as a sort of real Beings, that needed something to inhere in, were forced to find out the Word *Substance*, to support them. Had the poor *Indian* Philosopher (who imagined that the Earth also wanted something to bear it up) but thought of this Word *Substance*, he needed not to have been at the trouble to find an Elephant to support it, and a Tortoise to support his Elephant: The Word *Substance* would have done it effectually. And he that enquired, might have taken it for as good an Answer from an *Indian* Philosopher, That *Substance*, without knowing what it is, is that which supports the Earth, as we take it for a sufficient Answer, and good Doctrine, from our *European* Philosophers, That *Substance*, without knowing what it is, is that which supports *Accidents*. So that of *Substance*, we have no *Idea* of what it is, but only a confused obscure one of what it does.

§. 20. Whatever a learned Man may do here, an intelligent *American*, who enquired into the Nature of Things, would scarce

scarce take it for a satisfactory Account, if desiring to learn our Architecture, he should be told, That a Pillar was a thing supported by a *Basis*, and a *Basis* something that supported a Pillar. Would he not think himself mocked, instead of taught, with such an Account as this? And a Stranger to them would be very liberally instructed in the Nature of Books, and the things they contained, if he should be told, that all learned Books consisted of Paper and Letter, and that Letters were things inhering in Paper, and Paper a thing that held forth Letters; a notable way of having clear *Ideas* of Letters and Paper! But were the *Latin* Words *Inhærentia* and *Substantia*, put into the plain *English* ones that answer them, and were called *Sticking on*, and *Underpropping*, they would better discover to us the very great Clearness there is in the Doctrine of *Substance* and *Accidents*, and shew of what Use they are in deciding of Questions in Philosophy.

*A Vacuum beyond the utmost Bounds of Body.*

§. 21. But to return to our *Idea* of *Space*. If *Body* be not supposed infinite, which, I think, no one will affirm, I would ask, Whether, if GOD placed a Man at the Extremity of corporeal Beings, he could not stretch his Hand beyond his Body? If he could, then he would put his Arm, where there was before *Space* without *Body*; and if there he spread his Fingers, there would still be *Space* between them without *Body*: If he could not stretch out his Hand, it must be because of some external Hindrance; (for we suppose him alive, with such a Power of moving the Parts of his Body, that he hath now, which is not in it self impossible, if GOD so pleased to have it; or at least it is not impossible for God so to move him:) And then I ask, Whether that which hinders his Hand from moving outwards, be Substance or Accident, something or nothing? And when they have resolved that, they will be able to resolve themselves, what that is, which is, or may be between two Bodies at a Distance, that is not Body, has no Solidity. In the mean time, the Argument is at least as good, That where nothing hinders, (as beyond the utmost Bounds of all Bodies) a *Body* put into Motion may move on, as where there is nothing between, there two Bodies must necessarily touch: For pure *Space* between, is sufficient to take away the Necessity of mutual Contact; but bare *Space* in the way, is not sufficient to stop Motion. The Truth is, these Men must either own, that they think Body infinite, though they are loth to speak it out, or else affirm, that *Space* is not *Body*. For I would fain meet with

that thinking Man, that can, in his Thoughts, set any Bounds to Space, more than he can to Duration; or by thinking, hope to arrive at the End of either: And therefore, if his *Idea* of Eternity be infinite, so is his *Idea* of Immensity; they are both finite or infinite alike.

*The Power of Annihilation, proves a Vacuum.*

§. 22. Farther, those who assert the Impossibility of *Space* existing without *Matter*, must not only make Body infinite, but must also deny a Power in God to annihilate any part of Matter. No one, I suppose, will deny, that God can put an End to all Motion that is in Matter, and fix all the Bodies of the Universe in a perfect Quiet and Rest, and continue them so as long as he pleases. Whoever then will allow, that God can, during such a general Rest, annihilate either this Book, or the Body of him that reads it, must necessarily admit the Possibility of a *Vacuum*: For it is evident, that the Space that was filled by the Parts of the annihilated Body, will still remain, and be a Space without Body. For the circumambient Bodies being in perfect Rest, are a Wall of Adamant, and in that State make it a perfect Impossibility for any other Body to get into that Space. And indeed the necessary Motion of one Particle of Matter, into the place from whence another Particle of Matter is removed, is but a Consequence from the Supposition of Plenitude; which will therefore need some better Proof, than a supposed Matter of Fact, which Experiment can never make out, our own clear and distinct *Ideas* plainly satisfying us, that there is no necessary Connexion between *Space* and *Solidity*, since we can conceive the one without the other. And those who dispute for or against a *Vacuum*, do thereby confess they have distinct *Ideas* of *Vacuum* and *Plenum*, i. e. that they have an *Idea* of Extension void of Solidity, though they deny its Existence; or else they dispute about nothing at all. For they who so much alter the Signification of Words, as to call *Extension*, *Body*, and consequently make the whole Essence of Body to be nothing but pure Extension, without Solidity, must talk absurdly whenever they speak of *Vacuum*, since it is impossible for Extension to be without Extension. For *Vacuum*, whether we affirm or deny its Existence, signifies Space without Body, whose very Existence no one can deny to be possible, who will not make Matter infinite, and take from God a Power to annihilate any Particle of it.

*Motion proves a Vacuum.*

§. 23. But not to go so far as beyond the utmost Bounds of Body in the Universe, nor appeal

to

to God's Omnipotency, to find a *Vacuum*, the *Motion* of Bodies that are in our View and Neighbourhood, seem to me plainly to evince it. For I desire any one so to divide a solid Body, of any Dimension he pleases, as to make it possible for the solid Parts to move up and down freely every way within the Bounds of that Superficies, if there be not left in it a void Space, as big as the least part into which he has divided the said solid Body. And if where the least Particle of the Body divided, is as big as a Mustard-Seed, a void Space equal to the bulk of a Mustard-Seed, be requisite to make room for the free Motion of the Parts of the divided Body within the Bounds of its Superficies, where the Particles of Matter are 100, 000, 000 less than a Mustard-Seed, there must also be a Space void of solid Matter, as big as 100, 000, 000 part of a Mustard-Seed; for if it hold in one, it will hold in the other, and so on *in infinitum*. And let this void Space be as little as it will, it destroys the Hypothesis of *Plenitude*. For if there can be a Space void of Body, equal to the smallest separate Particle of Matter now existing in Nature, 'tis still Space without Body, and makes as great a Difference between Space and Body, as if it were Μέσα χάσμα, a Distance as wide as any in Nature. And therefore, if we suppose not the void Space necessary to Motion, equal to the least parcel of the divided solid Matter, but to $\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{1000}$ of it, the same Consequence will always follow of Space, without Matter.

*The Ideas of Space and Body distinct.*

§. 24. But the Question being here, Whether the *Idea of Space* or *Extension* be *the same with the Idea of Body*, it is not necessary to prove the real Existence of a *Vacuum*, but the *Idea* of it; which 'tis plain Men have, when they enquire and dispute, whether there be a *Vacuum* or no? For if they had not the *Idea* of Space without Body, they could not make a Question about its Existence: And if their *Idea* of Body did not include in it something more than the bare *Idea* of Space, they could have no Doubt about the Plenitude of the World; and 'twould be as absurd to demand, whether there were Space without Body, as where there were Space without Space, or Body without Body, since these were but different Names of the same *Idea*.

*Extension being inseparable from Body, proves it not the same.*

§. 25. 'Tis true, the *Idea* of *Extension* joins it self so inseparably with all visible, and most tangible Qualities, that it suffers us to see no one, or feel very few external Objects, without taking in Impressions of Extension too. This Readiness

of

of Extension to make it self be taken notice of so constantly with other *Ideas*, has been the occasion, I guess, that some have made the whole Essence of *Body* to consist in Extension; which is not much to be wondered at, since some have had their Minds, by their Eyes and Touch, (the busiest of all our Senses) so filled with the *Idea* of Extension, and as it were, wholly possessed with it, that they allowed no Existence to any thing that had not Extension. I shall not now argue with those Men, who take the Measure and Possibility of all Being, only from their narrow and gross Imaginations: But having here to do only with those, who conclude the Essence of Body to be *Extension*, because, they say, they cannot imagine any sensible Quality of any Body without Extension, I shall desire them to consider, That had they reflected on their *Ideas* of Tastes and Smells, as much as on those of Sight and Touch; nay, had they examined their *Ideas* of Hunger and Thirst, and several other Pains, they would have found, that they included in them no *Idea* of Extension at all, which is but an Affection of Body, as well as the rest discoverable by our Senses, which are scarce acute enough to look into the pure Essences of Things.

§. 26. If those *Ideas*, which are constantly joined to all others, must therefore be concluded to be the Essence of those things which have constantly those *Ideas* joined to them, and are inseparable from them; then Unity is without doubt the Essence of every thing. For there is not any Object of Sensation or Reflection, which does not carry with it the *Idea* of one: But the Weakness of this kind of Argument, we have already shewn sufficiently.

*Ideas of Space and Solidity distinct.*

§. 27. To conclude, whatever Men shall think concerning the Existence of a *Vacuum*, this is plain to me, That we have as clear an *Idea of Space distinct from Solidity*, as we have of Solidity distinct from Motion, or Motion from Space. We have not any two more distinct *Ideas*, and we can as easily conceive Space without Solidity, as we can conceive Body or Space without Motion, though it be never so certain, that neither Body nor Motion can exist without Space. But whether any one will take Space to be only a Relation resulting from the Existence of other Beings at a Distance, or whether they will think the Words of the most knowing King *Solomon*, *The Heaven, and the Heaven of Heavens, cannot contain thee*: or those more emphatical ones of the inspired Philosopher St. *Paul*, *In him we live, move, and have our Being*, are to be understood in a literal Sense,

I leave

I leave every one to consider; only our *Idea* of *Space* is, I think, such as I have mentioned, and distinct from that of *Body*. For whether we consider in Matter it self, the Distance of its coherent solid Parts, and call it, in respect of those solid Parts, *Extension*; or whether considering it as lying between the Extremities of any Body in its several Dimensions, we call it *Length*, *Breadth*, and *Thickness*; or else considering it as lying between any two Bodies, or positive Beings, without any Consideration, whether there be any Matter or no between, we call it *Distance*. However named or considered, it is always the same uniform simple *Idea* of *Space*, taken from Objects, about which our Senses have been conversant, whereof having settled *Ideas* in our Minds, we can revive, repeat, and add them one to another as often as we will, and consider the Space or Distance so imagined, either as filled with solid Parts, so that another Body cannot come there without displacing and thrusting out the Body that was there before; or else as void of Solidity, so that a Body of equal Dimensions to that empty or pure Space, may be placed in it without the Removing or Expulsion of any thing that was there. But to avoid Confusion in Discourses concerning this Matter, it were possibly to be wished, that the Name *Extension* were applied only to Matter, or the Distance of the Extremities of the particular Bodies, and the Term *Expansion* to Space in general, with or without solid Matter possessing it, so as to say *Space* is *expanded*, and *Body extended*. But in this, every one has his Liberty; I propose it only for the more clear and distinct way of Speaking.

*Men differ little in clear simple* Ideas.

§. 28. The knowing precisely what our Words stand for, would, I imagine, in this, as well as a great many other Cases, quickly end the Dispute. For I am apt to think, that Men, when they come to examine them, find their simple *Ideas* all generally to agree, though in Discourse with one another, they perhaps confound one another with different Names. I imagine, that *Men* who abstract their Thoughts, and do well examine the *Ideas* of their own Minds, *cannot much differ in thinking*; however, they may perplex themselves with Words, according to the way of speaking of the several Schools or Sects they have been bred up in: Though amongst unthinking Men, who examine not scrupulously and carefully their own *Ideas*, and strip them not from the Marks Men use for them, but confound them with Words, there must be endless Dispute, Wrangling, and Jargon, especially if they be learned bookish Men, devoted

to

to some Sect, and accustomed to the Language of it; and have learned to talk after others. But if it should happen, that any two thinking Men should really have different *Ideas*, I do not see how they could discourse or argue one with another. Here I must not be mistaken, to think that every floating Imagination in Mens Brains, is presently of that sort of *Ideas* I speak of. 'Tis not easy for the Mind to put off those confused Notions and Prejudices it has imbibed from Custom, Inadvertency, and common Conversation: It requires Pains and Assiduity to examine its *Ideas*, 'till it resolves them into those clear and distinct simple ones, out of which they are compounded; and to see which, amongst its simple ones, have or have not a necessary Connexion and Dependence one upon another. 'Till a Man doth this in the primary and original Notions of Things, he builds upon floating and uncertain Principles, and will often find himself at a Loss.

## CHAP. XIV.

### *Of Duration, and its simple Modes.*

*Duration is fleeting Extension.*

§. 1. THERE is another sort of Distance or Length, the *Idea* whereof we get not from the permanent Parts of Space, but from the fleeting and perpetually perishing Parts of Succession. This we call *Duration*, the simple Modes whereof are any different Lengths of it, whereof we have distinct *Ideas*, as *Hours*, *Days*, *Years*, &c. *Time*, and *Eternity*.

*Its* Idea *from Reflection on the Train of our* Ideas.

§. 2. The Answer of a Great Man, to one who asked what Time was, *Si non rogas Intelligo*, (which amounts to this; the more I set my self to think of it, the less I understand it,) might perhaps perswade one, That *Time*, which reveals all other things, is it self not to be discovered. *Duration*, *Time*, and *Eternity*, are not, without Reason, thought to have something very abstruse in their Nature. But however remote these may seem from our Comprehension, yet if we trace them right to their Originals, I doubt not but one of those Sources of all our Knowledge, *viz. Sensation* and *Reflection*, will be able to furnish us with these *Ideas*, as clear and distinct as many other,

ther, which are thought much less obscure; and we shall find, that the *Idea* of Eternity it self is derived from the same common Original with the rest of our *Ideas*.

§. 3. To understand *Time* and *Eternity* aright, we ought with Attention to consider what *Idea* it is we have of *Duration*, and how we came by it. 'Tis evident to any one, who will but observe what passes in his own Mind, that there is a Train of *Ideas*, which constantly succeed one another in his Understanding, as long as he is awake. *Reflection* on these Appearances of several *Ideas*, one after another, in our Minds, is that which furnishes us with the *Idea* of *Succession*: And the Distance between any parts of that Succession, or between the Appearance of any two *Ideas* in our Minds, is that we call *Duration*. For whilst we are thinking, or whilst we receive successively several *Ideas* in our Minds, we know that we do exist; and so we call the Existence, or the Continuation of the Existence of our selves, or any thing else, commensurate to the Succession of any *Ideas* in our Minds, the *Duration* of our selves, or any such other thing co-existing with our Thinking.

§. 4. That we have our Notion of *Succession* and *Duration* from this Original, *viz.* from Reflection on the Train of *Ideas*, which we find to appear one after another in our own Minds, seems plain to me, in that we have no Perception of *Duration*, but by considering the Train of *Ideas*, that take their turns in our Understandings. When that Succession of *Ideas* ceases, our Perception of Duration ceases with it; which every one clearly experiments in himself, whilst he sleeps soundly, whether an Hour, or a Day, or a Month, or a Year; of which Duration of things, whilst he sleeps, or thinks not, he has no Perception at all, but it is quite lost to him; and the Moment wherein he leaves off to think, 'till the Moment he begins to think again, seems to him to have no Distance. And so I doubt not but it would be to a waking Man, if it were possible for him to keep only one *Idea* in his Mind, without Variation, and the Succession of others: And we see, that one who fixes his Thoughts very intently on one thing, so as to take but little Notice of the Succession of *Ideas* that pass in his Mind, whilst he is taken up with that earnest Contemplation, lets slip out of his Account a good part of that Duration, and thinks that time shorter than it is. But if Sleep commonly unites the distant Parts of Duration, it is because during that time we have no Succession of *Ideas* in our Minds. For if a Man, during his Sleep, Dreams, and Variety of *Ideas* make themselves perceptible in his Mind one

after

after another, he hath then, during such a Dreaming, a Sense of *Duration*, and of the Length of it. By which it is to me very clear, that Men derive their *Ideas* of Duration from their *Reflection on the Train of the* Ideas, they observe to succeed one another in their own Understandings, without which Observation they can have no Notion of *Duration*, whatever may happen in the World.

*The Idea of Duration applicable to things whilst we sleep.*

§. 5. Indeed a Man having from reflecting on the Succession and Number of his own Thoughts, got the Notion or *Idea* of *Duration*, he can apply that Notion to things, which exist while he does not think; as he that has got the *Idea* of Extension from Bodies by his Sight or Touch, can apply it to Distances, where no Body is seen or felt. And therefore, though a Man has no Perception of the Length of Duration, which passed whilst he slept or thought not; yet having observed the Revolution of Days and Nights, and found the Length of their Duration to be in Appearance regular and constant, he can, upon the Supposition, that that Revolution has proceeded after the same manner, whilst he was asleep or thought not, as it used to do at other times; he can, I say, imagine and make Allowance for the Length of *Duration*, whilst he slept. But if *Adam* and *Eve* (when they were alone in the World) instead of their ordinary Nights Sleep, had passed the whole twenty four Hours in one continued Sleep, the Duration of that twenty four Hours had been irrecoverably lost to them, and been for ever left out of their Accompt of Time.

*The Idea of Succession not from Motion.*

§. 6. Thus *by reflecting on the appearing of various* Ideas, *one after another in our Understandings, we get the Notion of Succession*; which if any one should think, we did rather get from our Observation of Motion by our Senses, he will, perhaps, be of my Mind, when he considers, that even Motion produces in his Mind an *Idea* of Succession, no otherwise than as it produces there a continued Train of distinguishable *Ideas*. For a Man looking upon a Body really moving, perceives yet no Motion at all, unless that Motion produces a constant Train *of successive* Ideas, *v.g.* a Man becalmed at Sea, out of sight of Land, in a fair Day, may look on the Sun, or Sea, or Ship, a whole Hour together, and perceive no Motion at all in either; though it be certain, that two, and perhaps all of them, have moved, during that time, a great way: But as soon as he perceives either of them to have changed Distance with some other Body, as

soon

soon as this Motion produces any new *Idea* in him, then he perceives that there has been Motion. But wherever a Man is, with all things at rest about him, without perceiving any Motion at all; if during this Hour of Quiet he has been thinking, he will perceive the various *Ideas* of his own Thoughts in his own Mind, appearing one after another, and thereby observe and find Succession where he could observe no Motion.

§. 7. And this, I think, is the Reason *why Motions very slow*, tho' they are constant, *are not perceived* by us; because in their remove from one sensible part towards another, their change of Distance is so slow, that it causes no new *Ideas* in us, but a good while one after another: And so not causing a constant Train of new *Ideas*, to follow one another immediately in our Minds, we have no Perception of Motion; which consisting in a constant Succession, we cannot perceive that Succession without a constant Succession of varying *Ideas* arising from it.

§. 8. On the contrary, *things that move* so swift, as not to affect the Senses distinctly with several distinguishable Distances of their Motion, and so cause not any Train of *Ideas* in the Mind, *are not* also *perceived* to move. For any thing that moves round about in a Circle in less time than our *Ideas* are wont to succeed one another in our Minds, is not perceived to move; but seems to be a perfect, entire Circle of that Matter or Colour, and not a part of a Circle in Motion.

§. 9. Hence I leave it to others to judge, whether it be not probable, that our *Ideas* do, whilst we are awake, succeed one another in our Minds at certain Distances, not much unlike the Images in the inside of a Lanthorn, turned round by the Heat of a Candle. This Appearance of theirs in Train, though, perhaps, it may be sometimes faster, and sometimes slower; yet, I guess, varies not very much in a waking Man: There seem to be *certain Bounds to the Quickness and Slowness of the Succession of* those *Ideas* one to another in our Minds, beyond which they can neither delay nor hasten.

*The Train of Ideas has a certain degree of Quickness.*

§. 10. The Reason I have for this odd Conjecture, is, from observing that in the Impressions made upon any of our Senses, we can but to a certain degree perceive any Succession; which if exceeding quick, the Sense of Succession is lost, even in Cases where it is evident, that there is a real Succession. Let a Cannon Bullet pass through a Room, and in its way take with it any Limb, or fleshy Parts of a Man; 'tis as clear as any Demonstration can be, that it must strike successively the two sides

of

of the Room: 'Tis also evident, that it must touch one part of the Flesh first, and another after; and so in Succession: And yet I believe no Body, who ever felt the Pain of such a Shot, or heard the Blow against the two distant Walls, could perceive any Succession, either in the Pain or Sound of so swift a Stroke. Such a part of Duration as this, wherein we perceive no Succession, is that which we may call an *Instant*; and is *that which takes up the time of only one Idea* in our Minds, without the Succession of another, wherein therefore we perceive no Succession at all.

§. 11. This also happens, *where the Motion is so slow*, as not to supply a constant Train of fresh *Ideas* to the Senses, as fast as the Mind is capable of receiving new ones into it; and so other *Ideas* of our own Thoughts, having room to come into our Minds, between those offered to our Senses by the moving Body, *there the Sense of Motion is lost*; and the Body, though it really moves, yet not changing perceivable Distance with some other Bodies, as fast as the *Ideas* of our own Minds do naturally follow one another in Train, the thing seems to stand still, as is evident in the Hands of Clocks, and Shadows of Sun-dials, and other constant, but slow Motions, where, though after certain Intervals, we perceive by the Change of Distance, that it hath moved, yet the Motion it self we perceive not.

*This Train the Measure of other Successions.*

§. 12. So that to me it seems, that *the constant and regular Succession of Ideas* in a waking Man, *is*, as it were, *the Measure* and Standard *of all other Successions*, whereof if any one either exceeds the pace of our *Ideas*, as where two Sounds or Pains, *&c.* take up in their Succession the Duration of but one *Idea*, or else where any Motion or Succession is so slow, as that it keeps not pace with the *Ideas* in our Minds, or the Quickness, in which they take their turns; as when any one or more *Ideas*, in their ordinary Course, come into our Mind between those which are offered to the Sight by the different perceptible Distances of a Body in Motion, or between Sounds or Smells following one another, there also the Sense of a constant continued Succession is lost, and we perceive it not, but with certain Gaps of Rest between.

*The Mind cannot fix long on one invariable* Idea.

§. 13. If it be so, that the *Ideas* of our Minds, whilst we have any there, do constantly change and shift in a continual Succession, it would be impossible, may any one say, for a Man to think long of any one thing: By which, if it be meant, that

that a Man may *have one self-same single* Idea *a long time alone in his Mind, without any Variation at all*, I think, in Matter of Fact, it is *not possible*, for which (not knowing how the *Ideas* of our Minds are framed, of what Materials they are made, whence they have their Light, and how they come to make their Appearances,) I can give no other Reason but Experience: And I would have any one try, whether he can keep one unvaried single *Idea* in his Mind, without any other, for any considerable time together.

§. 14. For Trial, let him take any Figure, any Degree of Light or Whiteness, or what other he pleases; and he will, I suppose, find it difficult to keep all other *Ideas* out of his Mind: But that some, either of another kind, or various Consideration of that *Idea*, (each of which Considerations is a new *Idea*) will constantly succeed one another in his Thoughts, let him be as wary as he can.

§. 15. All that is in a Man's Power in this Case, I think, is only to mind and observe what the *Ideas* are, that take their turns *in* his Understanding; or else to direct the sort, and call in such as he hath a desire or use of: But hinder the *constant Succession* of fresh ones, I think he cannot, though he may commonly chuse, whether he will heedfully observe and consider them.

Ideas, *however made, include no Sense of Motion.*

§. 16. Whether these several *Ideas* in a Man's Mind be made by certain Motions, I will not here dispute: But this I am sure, that they include no *Idea* of Motion in their Appearance; and if a Man had not the *Idea* of Motion otherwise, I think he would have none at all, which is enough to my present Purpose; and sufficiently shews, that the Notice we take of the *Ideas* of our Minds, appearing there one after another, is that which gives us the *Idea* of Succession and Duration, without which we should have no such *Ideas* at all. 'Tis *not* then *Motion*, but the constant Train of *Ideas* in our Minds, whilst we are waking, *that furnishes us with the* Idea *of Duration*, whereof Motion no otherwise gives us any Perception, than as it causes in our Minds a constant Succession of *Ideas*, as I have before shewed: And we have as clear an *Idea* of Succession and Duration, by the Train of other *Ideas* succeeding one another in our Minds, without the *Idea* of any Motion, as by the Train of *Ideas* caused by the uninterrupted sensible Change of Distance between two Bodies, which we have from Motion; and therefore we should as well have the *Idea* of Duration, were there no Sense of Motion at all.

*Time is Duration set out by Measures.*

§. 17. Having thus got the *Idea* of Duration, the next thing natural for the Mind to do, is, to get some *Measure of* this common *Duration*, whereby it might judge of its different Lengths, and consider the distinct Order, wherein several things exist, without which, a great part of our Knowledge would be confused, and a great part of History be rendered very useless. This Consideration of Duration, as set out by certain Periods, and marked by certain Measures or *Epochs*, is that, I think, which most properly we call *Time*.

*A good Measure of Time must divide its whole Duration into equal Periods.*

§. 18. In the measuring of Extension, there is nothing more required, but the Application of the Standard or Measure we make use of to the thing, of whose Extension we would be informed. But in the measuring of Duration, this cannot be done, because no two different parts of Succession can be put together to measure one another: And nothing being a *Measure of Duration*, but Duration, as nothing is of Extension, but Extension, we cannot keep by us any standing unvarying Measure of Duration, which consists in a constant fleeting Succession, as we can of certain Lengths of Extension, as Inches, Feet, Yards, *&c.* marked out in permanent parcels of Matter. Nothing then could serve well for a convenient Measure of Time, but what has divided the whole Length of its Duration into apparently equal Portions, by constantly repeated Periods. What Portions of Duration are not distinguished, or considered as distinguished and measured by such Periods, come not so properly under the Notion of Time, as appears by such Phrases as these, *viz.* *Before all Time, and when Time shall be no more.*

*The Revolutions of the Sun and Moon the properest Measures of Time.*

§. 19. The diurnal and annual *Revolutions of the Sun*, as having been from the beginning of Nature, constant, regular, and universally observable by all Mankind, and supposed equal to one another, have been with Reason *made use of for the Measure of Duration*. But the Distinction of Days and Years, having depended on the Motion of the Sun, it has brought this Mistake with it, that it has been thought, that Motion and Duration were the Measure one of another. For Men in the *measuring of the Length of Time*, having been accustomed to the *Ideas* of Minutes, Hours, Days, Months, Years, *&c.* which they found themselves upon any mention of Time or Duration, presently to think on, all which Portions

Portions of Time were measured out by the Motion of those Heavenly Bodies, they were apt to confound Time and Motion; or at least to think, that they had a necessary Connexion one with another: Whereas any constant periodical Appearance, or Alteration of *Ideas* is seemingly equidistant Spaces of Duration, if constant and universally observable, would have as well distinguished the Intervals of Time, as those that have been made use of. For supposing the Sun, which some have taken to be a Fire, had been lighted up at the same Distance of Time that it now every Day comes about to the same Meridian, and then gone out again about twelve Hours after, and that in the Space of an annual Revolution, it had sensibly increased in Brightness and Heat, and so decreased again; would not such regular Appearances serve to measure out the Distances of Duration to all that could observe it, as well without as with Motion? For if the Appearances were constant, universally observable, and in equidistant Periods, they would serve Mankind for Measure of Time as well, were the Motion away.

*But not by their Motion, but periodical Appearances.*

§. 20. For the freezing of Water, or the blowing of a Plant, returning at equidistant Periods in all Parts of the Earth, would as well serve Men to reckon their Years by, as the Motions of the Sun: And in effect we see, that some People in *America* counted their Years by the coming of certain Birds amongst them at their certain Seasons, and leaving them at others. For a Fit of an Ague, the Sense of Hunger or Thirst, a Smell, or a Taste, or any other *Idea* returning constantly at equidistant Periods, and making it self universally be taken Notice of, *would* not fail to *measure* out the Course of Succession, and distinguish the Distances of *Time*. Thus we see, that Men born blind count Time well enough by Years, whose Revolutions yet they cannot distinguish by Motions, that they perceive not: And I ask, whether a blind Man, who distinguished his Years either by Heat of Summer, or Cold of Winter; by the Smell of any Flower of the Spring, or Taste of any Fruit of the Autumn, would not have a better Measure of Time than the *Romans* had before the Reformation of their *Calendar* by *Julius Cæsar*, or many other People, whose Years, notwithstanding the Motion of the Sun, which they pretend to make use of, are very irregular? And it adds no small Difficulty to Chronology, that the exact Lengths of the Years that several Nations counted by, are hard to be known, they differing very much one from another, and I think I may say all of them, from the

precise Motion of the Sun: And if the Sun moved from the Creation to the Flood constantly in the Æquator, and so equally dispersed its Light and Heat to all the habitable Parts of the Earth, in Days all of the same Length, without its annual Variations to the Tropicks, as a late ingenious Author supposes, I do not think it very easy to imagine, that (notwithstanding the Motion of the Sun) Men should in the *Antediluvian* World, from the Beginning count by Years, or measure their Time by Periods, that had no sensible Marks very obvious to distinguish them by.

*No two parts of Duration can be certainly known to be equal.*

§. 21. But perhaps it will be said, without a regular Motion, such as of the Sun, or some other, how could it ever be known, that such Periods were equal? To which I answer, the Equality of any other returning Appearances might be known by the same way that that of Days was known, or presumed to be so at first, which was only by judging of them by the Train of *Ideas* had passed in Mens Minds in the Intervals, by which Train of *Ideas* discovering Inequality in the natural Days, but none in the artificial Days, the artificial Days, or νυχθήμερα were guessed to be equal, which was sufficient to make them serve for a Measure: Tho' exacter Search has since discovered Inequality in the diurnal Revolutions of the Sun, and we know not whether the annual also be not unequal: These yet by their presum'd and apparent Equality, serve as well to reckon Time by, (though not to measure the Parts of Duration exactly) as if they could be proved to be exactly equal. We must therefore carefully distinguish betwixt Duration it self, and the Measures we make use of to judge of its Length. Duration in it self, is to be considered as going on in one constant, equal, uniform Course: But none of the Measures of it, which we make use of, can be known to do so; nor can we be assured, that their assigned Parts or Periods are equal in Duration one to another; for two successive Lengths of Duration, however measured, can never be demonstrated to be equal. The Motion of the Sun, which the World used so long, and so confidently, for an exact Measure of Duration, has, as I said, been found in its several parts unequal: And though Men have of late made use of a Pendulum, as a more steady and regular Motion, than that of the Sun, (or to speak more truly) of the Earth; yet if any one should be asked how he certainly knows that the two successive Swings of a Pendulum are equal, it would be very hard to satisfie himself, that they are infallibly so:

so: Since we cannot be sure, that the Cause of that Motion, which is unknown to us, shall always operate equally; and we are sure that the Medium in which the Pendulum moves, is not constantly the same: Either of which varying, may alter the Equality of such Periods, and thereby destroy the Certainty and Exactness of the Measure by Motion, as well as any other Periods of other Appearances, the Notion of Duration still remaining clear, though our Measures of it cannot any of them be demonstrated to be exact. Since then no two Portions of Succession can be brought together, it is impossible ever certainly to know their Equality. All that we can do for a Measure of Time, is to take such as have continual successive Appearances at seemingly equidistant Periods; *of* which *seeming Equality, we have no other Measure, but* such as *the Train of our own Ideas* have lodged in our Memories, with the Concurrence of other probable Reasons, to perswade us of their Equality.

*Time not the Measure of Motion.*

§. 22. One thing seems strange to me, that whilst all Men manifestly measured Time by the Motion of the great and visible Bodies of the World, *Time* yet should be *defined* to be the *Measure of Motion*: Whereas 'tis obvious to every one, who reflects ever so little on it, that, to measure Motion, Space is as necessary to be considered as Time; and those who look a little farther, will find also the Bulk of the thing moved necessary to be taken into the Computation by any one who will estimate or measure Motion, so as to judge right of it. Nor, indeed, does Motion any otherwise conduce to the measuring of Duration, than as it constantly brings about the Return of certain sensible *Ideas*, in seeming equidistant Periods. For if the Motion of the Sun were as unequal as of a Ship driven by unsteady Winds, sometimes very slow, and at others irregularly very swift: or if being constantly equally swift, it yet was not circular, and produced not the same Appearances, it would not at all help us to measure Time, any more than the seeming unequal Motion of a Comet does.

*Minutes, Hours, and Years, not necessary Measures of Duration.*

§. 23. *Minutes, Hours, Days, and Years,* are then *no* more *necessary to Time* or Duration, than Inches, Feet, Yards, and Miles, marked out in any Matter, are to Extension. For though we in this part of the Universe, by the constant Use of them, as of Periods set out by the Revolutions of the Sun, or as known Parts of such Periods, have fixed the *Ideas* of such Lengths of Duration in our Minds, which we apply

to all Parts of Time, whose Lengths we would consider; yet there may be other Parts of the Universe, where they no more use these Measures of ours, than in *Japan* they do our Inches, Feet, or Miles: But yet something Analogous to them, there must be. For without some regular periodical Returns, we could not measure our selves, or signifie to others, the Length of any Duration, though at the same time the World were as full of Motion, as it is now, but no part of it disposed into regular and apparently equidistant Revolutions. But the different Measures that may be made use of for the Account of Time, do not at all alter the Notion of Duration, which is the thing to be measured, no more than the different Standards of a Foot and a Cubit, alter the Notion of Extension to those, who make use of those different Measures.

*One measure of Time applicable to Duration before Time.*

§. 25. The Mind having once got such a Measure of Time, as the annual Revolution of the Sun, can apply that Measure to Duration, wherein that Measure it self did not exist, and with which in the Reality of its Being, it had nothing to do: For should one say, That *Abraham* was born in the 2712 Year of the *Julian* Period, it is altogether as intelligible, as reckoning from the Beginning of the World, though there were so far back no Motion of the Sun, nor any other Motion at all. For though the *Julian* Period be supposed to begin several hundred Years before there were really either Days, Nights, or Years, marked out by any Revolutions of the Sun, yet we reckon as right, and thereby measure Durations as well, as if really at that time the Sun had existed, and kept the same ordinary Motion it doth now. The *Idea of Duration equal to an annual Revolution of the Sun*, is as easily *applicable* in our Thoughts *to Duration, where no Sun nor Motion was*, as the *Idea* of a Foot or Yard taken from Bodies here, can be applied in our Thoughts to Distances beyond the Confines of the World, where are no Bodies at all.

§. 26. For supposing it were 5639 Miles, or Millions of Miles, from this place to the remotest Body of the Universe, (for being finite, it must be at a certain Distance,) as we suppose it to be 5639 Years from this Time to the first Existence of any Body in the Beginning of the World, *we can*, in our Thoughts, *apply this Measure of a Year to Duration before the Creation*, or beyond the Duration of Bodies or Motion, as we can this Measure of a Mile to Space beyond the utmost Bodies; and by the one measure Duration, where there was no Motion, as well as by

the

the other measure Space in our Thoughts, where there is no Body.

§. 27. If it be objected to me here, That in this way of explaining of Time, I have begg'd what I should not, *viz.* That the World is neither eternal, nor infinite; I answer, That to my present Purpose, it is not needful, in this place, to make use of Arguments, to evince the World to be finite, both in Duration and Extension: But it being at least as conceivable as the contrary, I have certainly the Liberty to suppose it, as well as any one hath to suppose the contrary; and I doubt not but that *every one* that will go about it, may easily *conceive* in his Mind *the beginning of Motion, though not of all Duration*; and so may come to a stop, and *non ultra* in his Consideration of Motion: So also in his Thoughts he may set Limits to Body, and the Extension belonging to it, but not to Space where no Body is, the utmost Bounds of Space and Duration being beyond the reach of Thought, as well as the utmost Bounds of Number are beyond the largest Comprehension of the Mind, and all for the same Reason, as we shall see in another place.

§. 28. By the same Means therefore, and from the same Original that we come to have *the Idea of* Time, we have also that *Idea* which we call *Eternity*; *viz.* having got the *Idea* of Succession and Duration, by reflecting on the Train of our own *Ideas*, caused in us either by the natural Appearances of those *Ideas* coming constantly of themselves into our waking Thoughts, or else caused by external Objects successively affecting our Senses; and having from the Revolutions of the Sun got the *Ideas* of certain Lengths of Duration, we can, in our Thoughts, add such Lengths of Duration to one another, as often as we please, and apply them, so added, to Durations past or to come: And this we can continue to do on, without Bounds or Limits, and proceed *in infinitum*, and apply thus the Length of the annual Motion of the Sun to Duration, supposed before the Sun's, or any other Motion had its Being; which is no more difficult or absurd, than to apply the Notion I have of the moving of a Shadow, one Hour to Day upon the Sun-dial, to the Duration of something last Night; *v. g.* the burning of a Candle, which is now absolutely separate from all actual Motion, and it is as impossible for the Duration of that Flame for an Hour last Night, to co-exist with any Motion that now is, or for ever shall be, as for any part of Duration, that was before the beginning of the World, to co-exist with the Motion of the Sun now. But yet this hinders not, but that *Eternity.*

having the *Idea* of the Length of the Motion of the Shadow on a Dial between the Marks of two Hours, I can as distinctly measure in my Thoughts the Duration of that Candle-light last Night, as I can the Duration of any thing that does now exist: And it is no more than to think, that had the Sun shone then on the Dial, and moved after the same rate it doth now, the Shadow on the Dial would have passed from one Hour-line to another, whilst that Flame of the Candle lasted.

§. 29. The Notion of an Hour, Day, or Year, being only the *Idea* I have of the Length of certain periodical regular Motions, neither of which Motions do ever all at once exist, but only in the *Ideas* I have of them in my Memory derived from my Senses or Reflection, I can with the same Ease, and for the same Reason, apply it in my Thoughts to Duration antecedent to all manner of Motion, as well as to any thing, that is but a Minute, or a Day, antecedent to the Motion, that at this very moment the Sun is in. All things past are equally and perfectly at rest; and to this way of Consideration of them, are all one, whether they were before the beginning of the World, or but yesterday; *the measuring of* any *Duration* by some Motion, *depending* not at all *on* the real Co-existence of that Thing to that Motion, or any other Periods of Revolution, but the having *a clear Idea of the Length of some* periodical known Motion, or other Intervals of *Duration* in my Mind, and *applying that to the Duration of the thing I would measure.*

§. 30. Hence we see, that some Men imagine the Duration of the World from its first Existence, to this present Year 1689. to have been 5639 Years, or equal to 5639 annual Revolutions of the Sun, and others a great deal more; as the *Ægyptians* of old, who in the time of *Alexander* counted 23000 Years from the Reign of the Sun; and the *Chineses* now, who account the 3, 269, 000 Years old, or more; which longer Duration of the World, according to their Computation, though I should not believe to be true, yet I can equally imagine it with them, and as truly understand, and say one is longer than the other, as I understand, that *Methusalem*'s Life was longer than *Enoch*'s: And if the common reckoning of 5639 should be true, (as it may be, as well as any other assigned,) it hinders not at all my imagining what others mean, when they make the World 1000 Years older, since every one may with the same Facility imagine (I do not say believe) the World to be 50000 Years old, as 5639; and may as well conceive the Duration of 50000 Years, as 5639. Whereby it appears, that *to the measuring the Duration*

of

*of any thing by Time*, it is not requisite, that that thing should be co-existent to the Motion we measure by, or any other periodical Revolution; but *it suffices* to this Purpose, *that we have the Idea of the Length of any regular periodical Appearances*, which we can in our Minds apply to Duration, with which the Motion or Appearance never co-existed.

§. 31. For as in the History of the Creation delivered by *Moses*, I can imagine that Light existed three Days before the Sun was, or had any Motion, barely by thinking, that the Duration of Light before the Sun was created, was so long as (if the Sun had moved then, as it doth now,) would have been equal to three of his diurnal Revolutions; so by the same way I can have an *Idea* of the *Chaos*, or Angels, being created before there was either Light, or any continued motion, a Minute, an Hour, a Day, a Year, or 1000 Years. For if I can but consider *Duration* equal to one Minute, before either the Being or Motion of any Body, I can add one Minute more till I come to 60; And by the same way of adding Minutes, Hours, or Years, (*i. e.* such or such parts of the Sun's Revolution, or any other Period, whereof I have the *Idea*,) proceed *in infinitum*, and suppose a Duration exceeding as many such Periods as I can reckon, let me add whilst I will, which I think is the Notion we have of *Eternity*, of whose Infinity we have no other Notion, than we have of the Infinity of Number, to which we can add for ever without end.

§. 32. And thus I think it is plain, that *from* those two Fountains of all Knowledge before-mentioned, (*viz.*) *Reflection and Sensation, we get the Ideas of Duration*, and the Measures of it.

For *First*, By observing what passes in our Minds, how our *Ideas* there in Train constantly some vanish, and others begin to appear, we come by the *Idea* of *Succession*.

*Secondly*, By observing a Distance in the Parts of this Succession, we get the *Idea* of *Duration*.

*Thirdly*, By Sensation observing certain Appearances, at certain regular and seeming equidistant periods, we get the *Ideas* of certain Lengths or *Measures of Duration*, as Minutes, Hours, Days, Years, *&c.*

*Fourthly*, By being able to repeat those Measures of Time, or *Ideas* of stated Length of Duration in our Minds, as often as we will, we can come to *imagine Duration, where nothing does really endure or exist*; and thus we imagine to Morrow, next Year, or seven Years hence.

*Fifthly*,

*Fifthly*, By being able to repeat any such *Idea* of any Length of Time, as of a Minute, a Year, or an Age, as often as we will in our own Thoughts, and add them one to another, without ever coming to the end of such Addition, any nearer than we can to the end of Number, to which we can always add, we come by the *Idea* of *Eternity*, as the future eternal Duration of our Souls, as well as the Eternity of that infinite Being, which must necessarily have always existed.

*Sixthly*, By considering any part of infinite Duration, as set out by periodical Measures, we come by the *Idea* of what we call *Time* in general.

---

## CHAP. XV.

### *Of Duration and Expansion, considered together.*

*Both capable of greater and less.*

§. 1. THough we have in the precedent Chapters dwelt pretty long on the Considerations of Space and Duration; yet they being *Ideas* of general Concernment, that have something very abstruse and peculiar in their Nature, the comparing them one with another may, perhaps, be of Use for their Illustration; and we may have the more clear and distinct Conception of them, by taking a View of them together. Distance or Space, in its simple abstract Conception, to avoid Confusion, I call *Expansion*, to distinguish it from *Extension*, which by some is used to express this Distance only as it is in the solid parts of Matter, and so includes, or at least intimates the *Idea* of Body: Whereas the *Idea* of pure Distance includes no such thing. I prefer also the Word *Expansion* to *Space*, because *Space* is often applied to Distance of fleeting successive parts, which never exist together, as well as to those which are permanent. In both these, (*viz. Expansion* and *Duration*) the Mind has this common *Idea* of continued Lengths, capable of greater, or less Quantities: For a Man has as clear an *Idea* of the Difference of the Length of an Hour, and a Day, as of an Inch and a Foot.

*Expansion not bounded by Matter.*

§. 2. The *Mind*, having got the *Idea* of the Length of any part of *Expansion*, let it be a Span, or a Pace, or what Length you will, *can*, as has been

been said, repeat that *Idea*; and so adding it to the former, *enlarge its Idea of Length*, and make it equal to two Spans, or two Paces, and so as often as it will, till it equals the Distance of any parts of the Earth one from another, and increase thus, 'till it amounts to the Distance of the Sun, or remotest Star. By such a progression as this, setting out from the place where it is, or any other place, it can proceed and pass beyond all those Lengths, and find nothing to stop its going on, either in, or without Body. 'Tis true, we can easily in our Thoughts come to the end of solid Extension; the Extremity and Bounds of all Body, we have no Difficulty to arrive at: But when the Mind is there, it finds nothing to hinder its Progress into this endless Expansion; of that it can neither find nor conceive any end. Nor let any one say, That beyond the Bounds of Body, there is nothing at all, unless he will confine GOD within the Limits of Matter. *Solomon*, whose Understanding was filled and enlarged with Wisdom, seems to have other Thoughts, when he says, *Heaven, and the Heaven of Heavens, cannot contain Thee*: And he, I think, very much magnifies to himself the Capacity of his own Understanding, who persuades himself, that he can extend his Thoughts farther than GOD exists, or imagine any Expansion where he is not.

*Nor Duration by Motion.*

§. 3. Just so is it in Duration. *The Mind having got the Idea of any Length of Duration, can double, multiply, and enlarge it*, not only beyond its own, but beyond the Existence of all corporeal Beings, and all the Measures of Time, taken from the great Bodies of the World, and their Motions. But yet every one easily admits, That though we make Duration boundless, as certainly it is, we cannot yet extend it beyond all Being. GOD, every one easily allows, fills Eternity; and 'tis hard to find a Reason, why any one should doubt, that he likewise fills Immensity? His infinite Being is certainly as boundless one way as another; and methinks it ascribes a little too much to Matter, to say, where there is no Body, there is nothing.

*Why Men more easily admit infinite Duration, than infinite Expansion.*

§. 4. Hence, I think, we may learn the Reason, *why every one* familiarly, and without the least Hesitation, speaks of, and supposes Eternity, and sticks not to *ascribe Infinity to Duration*; *but* 'tis *with more doubting* and reserve, that many *admit*, or suppose *the Infinity of Space*. The Reason whereof seems to me to be this, that Duration and Extension being used as Names of Affections belonging to other Beings,

ings, we easily conceive in GOD infinite Duration, and we cannot avoid doing so: But not attributing to him Extension, but only to Matter, which is finite, we are apter to doubt of the Existence of Expansion without Matter; of which alone we commonly suppose it an Attribute. And therefore when Men pursue their Thoughts of Space, they are apt to stop at the Confines of Body; as if Space were there at an end too, and reached no farther. Or if their *Ideas* upon Consideration carry them farther, yet they term what is beyond the Limits of the Universe, imaginary Space; as if it were nothing, because there is no Body existing in it. Whereas Duration, antecedent to all Body, and to the Motions, which it is measured by, they never term imaginary; because it is never supposed void of some other real Existence. And if the Names of things may at all direct our Thoughts towards the Originals of Mens *Ideas*, (as I am apt to think they may very much,) one may have occasion to think by the Name *Duration*, that the Continuation of Existence, with a kind of Resistance, to any destructive Force, and the Continuation of Solidity, (which is apt to be confounded with, and if we will look into the minute anatomical parts of Matter, is little different from Hardness,) were thought to have some Analogy, and gave occasion to Words, so near of kin as *Durare* and *Durum esse*. And that *Durare* is applied to the *Idea* of Hardness, as well as that of Existence we see in *Horace, Epod.* 16. *ferro duravit sæcula.* But be that as it will, this is certain, That whoever pursues his own Thoughts, will find them sometimes launch out beyond the Extent of Body, into the Infinity of Space or Expansion; the *Idea* whereof is distinct and separate from Body, and all other things: which may (to those who please) be a Subject of farther Meditation.

*Time to Duration, is as Place to Expansion.*

§. 5. *Time* in general is to *Duration*, as *Place* to *Expansion*. They are so much of those boundless Oceans of Eternity and Immensity, as is set out and distinguished from the rest, as it were by Landmarks; and so are made use of, to denote the Position of finite real Beings, in respect one to another, in those uniform infinite Oceans of Duration and Space. These rightly considered, are nothing but *Ideas* of determinate Distances, from certain known Points fixed in distinguishable sensible things, and supposed to keep the same Distance one from another. From such Points fixed in sensible Beings we reckon, and from them we measure our Portions of those infinite Quantities; which so considered, are that which we call *Time* and *Place*.

*Place.* For Duration and Space being in themselves uniform and boundless, the Order and Position of things, without such known settled Points, would be lost in them; and all things would lie jumbled in an incurable Confusion.

*Time and Place are taken for so much of either, as are set out by the Existence and Motion of Bodies.*

§. 6. *Time* and *Place* taken thus, for determinate distinguishable Portions of those infinite Abysses of Space and Duration, set out, or supposed to be distinguished from the rest, by Marks, and known Boundaries, have each of them a two-fold Acceptation.

*First*, *Time* in general is commonly taken for so much of infinite Duration, as is measured out by, and co-existent with the Existence, and Motions of the great Bodies of the Universe, as far as we know any thing of them: And in this Sense, Time begins and ends with the Frame of this sensible World, as in these Phrases before-mentioned, *before all Time*, or *when Time shall be no more*. *Place* likewise is taken sometimes for that Portion of infinite Space, which is possessed by, and comprehended within the material World; and is thereby distinguished from the rest of Expansion; though this may more properly be called *Extension*, than Place. Within these two are confined, and by the observable Parts of them, are measured and determined the particular Time or Duration, and the particular Extension and Place, of all corporeal Beings.

*Sometimes for so much of either, as we design by Measures taken from the Bulk or Motion of Bodies.*

§. 7. *Secondly*, Sometimes the Word *Time* is used *in a larger Sense*, and is applied to Parts of that infinite Duration, not that were really distinguished and measured out by this real Existence, and periodical Motions of Bodies that were appointed from the Beginning to be for Signs, and for Seasons, and for Days, and Years, and are accordingly our Measures of Time; but such other Portions too of that infinite uniform Duration, which we, upon any Occasion, do suppose equal to certain Lengths of measured Time; and so consider them as bounded and determined. For if we should suppose the Creation, or Fall of the Angels, was at the Beginning of the *Julian* Period, we should speak properly enough, and should be understood, if we said, 'tis a longer Time since the Creation of Angels, than the Creation of the World, by 764 Years: Whereby we would mark out so much of that undistinguished Duration, as we suppose equal to, and would have admitted, 764 annual Revolutions of the Sun, moving at the Rate it now does. And thus likewise, we sometimes

speak

speak of Place, Distance, or Bulk in the great *Inane* beyond the Confines of the World, when we consider so much of that Space, as is equal to, or capable to receive a Body of any assigned Dimensions, as a Cubick-foot; or do suppose a Point in it, at such a certain Distance from any Part of the Universe.

*They belong to all Beings.*

§. 8. *Where* and *when* are Questions belonging to all finite Existences, and are by us always reckoned from some known Parts of this sensible World, and from some certain Epochs marked out to us by the Motions observable in it. Without some such fixed Parts or Periods, the Order of things would be lost, to our finite Understandings, in the boundless invariable Oceans of Duration and Expansion; which comprehend in them all finite Beings, and in their full Extent, belong only to the Deity. And therefore we are not to wonder, that we comprehend them not, and do so often find our Thoughts at a loss, when we would consider them, either abstractly in themselves, or as any way attributed to the first incomprehensible Being. But when applied to any particular finite Beings, the Extension of any Body is so much of that infinite Space, as the Bulk of that Body takes up. And Place is the Position of any Body, when considered at a certain Distance from some other. As the *Idea* of the particular *Duration* of any thing, is an *Idea* of that Portion of infinite *Duration*, which passes during the Existence of that thing; so the Time *when* the thing existed, is the *Idea* of that Space of Duration, which passed between some known and fixed Period of Duration, and the Being of that thing. One shews the Distance of the Extremities of the Bulk, or Existence of the same thing, as that it is a Foot Square, or lasted two Years; the other shews the Distance of it in Place, or Existence from other fixed Points of Space or Duration; as that it was in the middle of *Lincolns-Inn*-Fields, or the first Degree of *Taurus*, and in the Year of our Lord 1671, or the 1000 Year of the *Julian* Period: All which Distances, we measure by preconceived *Ideas* of certain Lengths of Space and Duration, as Inches, Feet, Miles, and Degrees, and in the other Minutes, Days, and Years, *&c.*

*All the Parts of Extension, are Extension; and all the Parts of Duration, are Duration.*

§. 9. There is one thing more, wherein *Space* and *Duration* have a great Conformity, and that is, though they are justly reckoned amongst our *simple Ideas*: Yet none of the distinct *Ideas* we have of either, is without all manner of *Composition*;

*sition* *; it is the very Nature of both of them to consist of Parts: But their Parts being all of the same kind, and without the Mixture of any other *Idea*, hinder them not from having a Place amongst simple *Ideas*. Could the Mind, as in Number, come to so small a Part of Extension or Duration, as excluded Divisibility, that would be, as it were, the indivisible Unite, or *Idea*; by Repetition of which, it would make its more inlarged *Ideas* of Extension and Duration. But since the Mind is not able to frame an *Idea* of any Space, without Parts; instead thereof it makes use of the common Measures, which by familiar Use, in each Country, have imprinted themselves on the Memory, (as Inches, and Feet; or Cubits, and Parasangs; and so Seconds, Minutes, Hours, Days, and Years in Duration:) The Mind makes use, I say, of such *Ideas* as these, as simple ones; and these are the component Parts of larger *Ideas*, which the Mind, upon Occasion, makes by the Addition of such known Lengths, which it is acquainted with. On the other

* It has been objected to Mr. *Locke*, that if Space consists of Parts, as 'tis confessed in this Place, he should not have reckoned it in the Number of Simple *Ideas*; because it seems to be inconsistent with what he says elsewhere, That a Simple *Idea* is *uncompounded, and contains in it nothing but one uniform Appearance, or Conception of the Mind, and is not distinguishable into different* Ideas, pag. 62. 'Tis farther objected, That Mr. *Locke* has not given in the 11th Chapter of the 2d Book, where he begins to speak of *Simple Ideas*, an exact Definition of what he understands by the Word *Simple Ideas*. To these Difficulties, Mr. *Locke* answers thus: To begin with the last, he declares, That he has not treated his Subject in an Order perfectly Scholastick, having not had much Familiarity with those sort of Books during the Writing of his, and not remembring at all the Method in which they are written; and therefore his Readers ought not to expect Definitions regularly placed at the Beginning of each new Subject. Mr. *Locke* contents himself to imploy the principal Terms that he uses, so that from his Use of them the Reader may easily comprehend what he means by them. But with Respect to the Term *Simple Idea*, he has had the good Luck to define that in the Place cited in the Objection; and therefore there is no Reason to supply that Defect. The Question then is to know, Whether the *Idea* of *Extension* agrees with this Definition? Which will effectually agree to it, if it be understood in the Sense which Mr. *Locke* had principally in his View; for that Composition which he designed to exclude in that Definition, was a Composition of different *Ideas* in the Mind, and not a Composition of the same kind in a Thing whose Essence consists in having Parts of the same kind, where you can never come to a Part intirely exempted from this Composition. So that if the *Idea* of *Extension* consists in having

ther side, the ordinary smallest Measure we have of either, look'd on as an Unite in Number, when the Mind by Division would reduce them into less Fractions. Though on both sides, both in Addition and Division, either of Space or Duration, when the *Idea* under Consideration becomes very big, or very small, its precise Bulk becomes very obscure and confused; and it is the Number of its repeated Additions, or Divisions, that alone remains clear and distinct, as will easily appear to any one, who will let his Thoughts loose in the vast Expansion of Space, or Divisibility of Matter. Every Part of Duration, is Duration too; and every Part of Extension, is Extension, both of them capable of Addition or Division *in infinitum*. But the least Portions of either of them, whereof we have clear and distinct *Ideas*, may perhaps be fittest to be considered by us, as the simple *Ideas* of that kind, out of which our complex Modes of Space, Extension, and Duration, are made up, and into which they can again be distinctly resolved. Such a small part in Duration, may be called a *Moment*, and is the Time of one *Idea* in our Minds, in the Train of their ordinary Succession there. The

---

ving *Partes extra Partes*, (as the Schools speaks,) 'tis always, in the Sense of Mr. *Locke*, a *Simple Idea*; because the *Idea* of having *Partes extra Partes*, cannot be resolved into two other *Ideas*. For the remainder of the Objection made to Mr. *Locke*, with Respect to the Nature of Extension, Mr. *Locke* was aware of it, as may be seen in §. 9. Ch. 15. of the 2d Book, where he says, That the least Portion of Space or Extension, whereof we have a clear and distinct *Idea*, may perhaps be the fittest to be consider'd by us as a *Simple Idea* of that kind, out of which our complex Modes of Space and Extension are made up. So that, according to Mr. *Locke*, it may very fitly be call'd a *Simple Idea*, since it is the least *Idea* of Space that the Mind can form to it self, and that cannot be divided by the Mind into any less whereof it has in it self any determined Perception. From whence it follows, that it is to the Mind one *Simple Idea*; and that is sufficient to take away this Objection; for 'tis not the Design of Mr. *Locke*, in this Place, to discourse of any thing but concerning the *Ideas* of the Mind. But if this is not sufficient to clear the Difficulty, Mr. *Locke* hath nothing more to add, but that if the *Idea* of Extension is so peculiar, that it cannot exactly agree with the Definition that he has given of those *Simple Ideas*, so that it differs in some manner from all others of that kind, he thinks 'tis better to leave it there expos'd to this Difficulty, than to make a new Division in his Favour. 'Tis enough for Mr. *Locke* that his Meaning can be understood. 'Tis very common to observe intelligible Discourses spoiled by too much Subtilty in nice Divisions. We ought to put things together, as well as we can, *Doctrinæ Causa*; but, after all, several Things will not be bundled up together under our Terms and Ways of Speaking.

other,

other, wanting a proper Name, I know not whether I may be allowed to call *a sensible Point*, meaning thereby the least Particle of Matter or Space we can discern, which is ordinarily about a Minute, and to the sharpest Eyes seldom less than thirty Seconds of a Circle, whereof the Eye is the Centre.

§. 10. Expansion and Duration, have this farther Agreement, that though they are both considered by us as having Parts; yet *their Parts* are *not separable* one from another, no not even in Thought: Though the Parts of Bodies, from whence we take our Measure of the one; and the Parts of Motion, or rather the Succession of *Ideas* in our Minds, from whence we take the Measure of the other, may be interrupted and separated; as the one is often by Rest, and the other is by Sleep, which we call Rest too. *Their Parts inseparable.*

§. 11. But yet there is this manifest difference between them, That the *Ideas* of Length, which we have of *Expansion, are turned every way*, and so make Figure, and Breadth, and Thickness; but *Duration is but as it were the Length of one streight Line*, extended *in infinitum*, not capable of Multiplicity, Variation, or Figure; but is one common Measure of all Existence whatsoever, wherein all things, whilst they exist, equally partake. For this present Moment is common to all things, that are now in being, and equally comprehends that part of their Existence, as much as if they were all but one single Being; and we may truly say, they all exist in the same Moment of Time. Whether Angels and Spirits have any Analogy to this, in Respect of Expansion, is beyond my Comprehension: And, perhaps, for us, who have Understandings and Comprehensions, suited to our own Preservation, and the Ends of our own Being, but not to the Reality and Extent of all other Beings, 'tis near as hard to conceive any Existence, or to have an *Idea* of any real Being, with a perfect Negation of all manner of Expansion; as it is, to have the *Idea* of any real Existence, with a perfect Negation of all manner of Duration: And therefore what Spirits have to do with Space, or how they communicate in it, we know not. All that we know is, that Bodies do each singly possess its proper Portion of it, according to the Extent of its solid Parts; and thereby exclude all other Bodies from having any Share in that particular Portion of Space, whilst it remains there. *Duration is as a Line, Expansion as a Solid.*

*Duration has never two Parts together, Expansion altogether.*

§. 12. *Duration*, and Time which is a Part of it, *is the Idea* we have *of perishing Distance, of which no two Parts exist together*, but follow each other in Succession; as *Expansion is the* Idea *of lasting Distance, all whose Parts exist together*, and are not capable of Succession. And therefore though we cannot conceive any Duration without Succession, nor can put it together in our Thoughts, that any Being does now exist to Morrow, or possess at once more than the present Moment of Duration; yet we can conceive the eternal Duration of the Almighty far different from that of Man, or any other finite Being. Because Man comprehends not in his Knowledge, or Power, all past and future things: His Thoughts are but of yesterday, and he knows not what to morrow will bring forth. What is once passed, he can never recal; and what is yet to come, he cannot make present. What I say of Man, I say of all finite Beings, who, though they may far exceed Man in Knowledge and Power, yet are no more than the meanest Creature, in Comparison with God himself. Finite of any Magnitude, holds not any Proportion to Infinite. God's infinite Duration being accompanied with infinite Knowledge, and infinite Power, he sees all things past and to come; and they are no more distant from his Knowledge, no farther removed from his Sight, than the present: They all lie under the same View: And there is nothing which he cannot make exist each Moment he pleases. For the Existence of all things, depending upon his good Pleasure; all things exist every Moment, that he thinks fit to have them exist. To conclude, Expansion and Duration do mutually imbrace, and comprehend each other; every Part of Space, being in every Part of Duration; and every Part of Duration, in every Part of Expansion. Such a Combination of two distinct *Ideas*, is, I suppose, scarce to be found in all that great Variety, we do or can conceive, and may afford Matter to farther Speculation.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XVI.

## *Of Number.*

*Number the simpleſt and moſt univerſal* Idea.

§. 1. AMongſt all the *Ideas* we have, as there is none ſuggeſted to the Mind by more Ways, ſo there is none more ſimple, than that *of Unity*, or One: It has no Shadow of Variety or Compoſition in it: every Object our Senſes are employed about; every *Idea* in our Underſtandings; every Thought of our Minds, brings this *Idea* along with it. And therefore it is the moſt intimate to our Thoughts, as well as it is, in its Agreement to all other things, the moſt univerſal *Idea* we have. For Number applies it ſelf to Men, Angels, Actions, Thoughts, every thing that either doth exiſt, or can be imagined.

*Its Modes made by Addition.*

§. 2. By repeating this *Idea* in our Minds, and adding the Repetitions together, we come by the *complex* Ideas *of the Modes of it.* Thus by adding one to one, we have the complex *Idea* of a Couple: by putting twelve Unites together, we have the complex *Idea* of a Dozen; and a Score, or a Million, or any other Number.

*Each Mode diſtinct.*

§. 3. *The ſimple Modes of Number are of all other the moſt diſtinct*; every the leaſt Variation, which is an Unite, making each Combination, as clearly different from that, which approacheth neareſt to it, as the moſt remote; Two being as diſtinct from one, as Two hundred; and the *Ideas* of Two, as diſtinct from the *Idea* of Three, as the Magnitude of the whole Earth, is from that of a Mite. This is not ſo in other ſimple Modes, in which it is not ſo eaſie, nor, perhaps, poſſible for us to diſtinguiſh betwixt two approaching *Ideas*, which yet are really different. For who will undertake to find a difference between the White of this Paper, and that of the next Degree to it? Or can form diſtinct *Ideas* of every the leaſt Exceſs in Extenſion?

*Therefore Demonſtrations in Numbers the moſt preciſe.*

§. 4. The Clearneſs and *Diſtinctneſs of each Mode of Number* from all others, even thoſe that approach neareſt, makes me apt to think, that Demonſtrations in Numbers, if they are not more evident and exact, than in Extenſion, yet they are more

general in their Use, and more determinate in their Application. Because the *Ideas* of Numbers are more precise, and distinguishable than in Extension; where every Equality and Excess are not so easie to be observed, or measured; because our Thoughts cannot in Space arrive at any determined Smallness, beyond which it cannot go, as an Unite; and therefore the Quantity or Proportion of any the least Excess cannot be discovered, which is clear otherwise in Number, where, as has been said, 91 is as distinguishable from 90, as from 9000, though 91 be the next immediate Excess to 90. But it is not so in Extension, where whatsoever is more than just a Foot, or an Inch, is not distinguishable from the Standard of a Foot, or an Inch; and in Lines, which appear of an equal Length, one may be longer than the other by innumerable Parts: Nor can any one assign an Angle, which shall be the next biggest to a right one.

*Names necessary to Numbers.*

§. 5. By the repeating, as has been said, of the *Idea* of an Unite, and joining it to another Unite, we make thereof one collective *Idea*, marked by the Name *Two*. And whosoever can do this, and proceed on, still adding one more to the last collective *Idea*, which he had of any Number, and give a Name to it, may count, or have *Ideas* for several Collections of Unites, distinguished one from another, as far as he hath a Series of Names for following Numbers, and a Memory to retain that Series, with their several Names: All *Numeration* being but still the adding of one Unite more, and giving to the whole together, as comprehended in one *Idea*, a new or distinct Name or Sign, whereby to know it from those before and after, and distinguish it from every smaller or greater multitude of Unites. So that he that can add one to one, and so to two, and so go on with his Tale, taking still with him the distinct Names belonging to every Progression; and so again, by substracting an Unite from each Collection, retreat and lessen them, is capable of all the *Ideas* of Numbers, within the Compass of his Language, or for which he hath Names, though not, perhaps, of more. For the several simple Modes of Numbers, being in our Minds, but so many Combinations of Unites, which have no variety, nor are capable of any other difference, but more or less, Names or Marks for each distinct Combination, seem more necessary, than in any other sort of *Ideas*. For without such Names or Marks, we can hardly well make use of Numbers in reckoning, especially where the Combination is made up of any great

great multitude of Unites; which put together without a Name or Marks, to distinguish that precise Collection, will hardly be kept from being a heap in Confusion.

§. 6. This, I think, to be the Reason why some *Americans*, I have spoken with, (who were otherwise of quick and rational Parts enough,) could not, as we do, by any means, count to 1000; nor had any distinct *Idea* of that Number, though they could reckon very well to 20. Because their Language being scanty, and accommodated only to the few Necessaries of a needy simple Life, unacquainted either with Trade or Mathematicks, had no Words in it to stand for 1000; so that when they were discoursed with of those greater Numbers, they would shew the Hairs of their Head, to express a great multitude, which they could not number; which Inability, I suppose, proceeded from their want of Names. The *Tououpinambos* had no Names for Numbers above 5; any Number beyond that, they made out by shewing their Fingers, and the Fingers of others who were present: And I doubt not but we our selves might distinctly number in Words, a great deal farther than we usually do, would we find out but some fit Denominations to signify them by; whereas in the way we take now to name them by Millions of Millions of Millions, *&c.* it is hard to go beyond eighteen, or at most four and twenty decimal Progressions, without Confusion. But to shew how much *distinct Names conduce to our well reckoning*, or having useful *Ideas* of Numbers, let us set all these following Figures, as the Marks of one Number: *v. g.*

*Names necessary to Numbers.*

*Histoire d'un Voyage fait en la Terre du Brasil, par Jean de Lery, c. 20.* $\frac{307}{382}$.

*Nonilions. Octilions. Septilions. Sextilions. Quintrilions.*
857324. 162486. 345896. 437916. 423147.

*Quatrilions. Trilions. Bilions. Milions. Unites.*
248106. 235421. 261734. 368149. 623137.

The ordinary way of naming this Number in *English*, will be the often repeating of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, of Millions, (which is the Denomination of the second six Figures.) In which way, it will be very hard to have any distinguishing Notions of this Number: But whether, by giving every six Figures a new and orderly Denomination, these, and perhaps a

great many more Figures, in Progreſſion, might not eaſily be counted diſtinctly, and *Ideas* of them both got more eaſily to our ſelves, and more plainly ſignified to others, I leave it to be conſidered. This I mention only to ſhew how neceſſary diſtinct Names are to Numbering, without pretending to introduce new ones of my Invention.

*Why Children number not earlier.*

§. 7. Thus Children, either for want of Names to mark the ſeveral Progreſſions of Numbers, or not having yet the Faculty to collect ſcattered *Ideas* into complex ones, and range them in a regular Order, and ſo retain them in their Memories, as is neceſſary to reckoning, do not begin to number very early, nor proceed in it very far or ſteadily, till a good while after they are well furniſhed with good ſtore of other *Ideas*; and one may often obſerve them diſcourſe and reaſon pretty well, and have very clear Conceptions of ſeveral other things, before they can tell 20. And ſome, through the default of their Memories, who cannot retain the ſeveral Combinations of Numbers, with their Names annexed in their diſtinct Orders, and the dependence of ſo long a Train of numeral Progreſſions, and their relation one to another, are not able all their life-time, to reckon, or regularly go over any moderate Series of Numbers. For he that will count Twenty, or have any *Idea* of that Number, muſt know, that Nineteen went before, with the diſtinct Name or Sign of every one of them, as they ſtand marked in their Order; for wherever this fails, a Gap is made, the Chain breaks, and the Progreſs in numbering can go no farther. So that *to reckon right, it is required*, 1. That the Mind diſtinguiſh carefully two *Ideas*, which are different one from another only by the Addition or Subtraction of one Unite. 2. That it retain in Memory the Names, or Marks, of the ſeveral Combinations from an Unite to that Number; and that not confuſedly, and at random, but in that exact Order, that the Numbers follow one another: In either of which, if it trips, the whole Buſineſs of Numbering will be diſturbed, and there will remain only the confuſed *Idea* of Multitude, but the *Ideas* neceſſary to diſtinct Numeration, will not be attained to.

*Number meaſures all Meaſurables.*

§. 8. This farther is obſervable in *Number*, That it is that which the Mind makes uſe of in *meaſuring all things*, that by us are meaſurable, which principally are *Expanſion* and *Duration*; and our *Idea* of Infinity, even when applied to thoſe, ſeems to be nothing, but the Infinity of Number. For what elſe are our

our *Ideas* of Eternity and Immensity, but the repeated Additions of certain *Ideas* of imagined Parts of Duration, and Expansion, with the Infinity of Number, in which we can come to no end of Addition? For such an inexhaustible Stock, Number, of all other our *Ideas*, most clearly furnishes us with, as is obvious to every one. For let a Man collect into one Sum, as great a Number as he pleases, this Multitude, how great soever, lessens not one jot the Power of adding to it, or brings him any nearer the end of the inexhaustible Stock of Number, where still there remains as much to be added, as if none were taken out. And this endless *Addition* or *Addibility* (if any one like the Word better) of Numbers, so apparent to the Mind, is that, I think, which gives us the clearest and most distinct *Idea* of Infinity: Of which more in the following Chapter.

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Of Infinity.*

*Infinity, in its original Intention, attributed to Space, Duration, and Number.*

§. 1. HE that would know what kind of *Idea* it is to which we give the Name of *Infinity*, cannot do it better, than by considering to what Infinity is by the Mind more immediately attributed, and then how the Mind comes to frame it.

*Finite* and *Infinite*, seem to me to be looked upon by the Mind, as the *Modes of Quantity*, and to be attributed primarily in their first Designation only to those things, which have Parts, and are capable of Increase or Diminution, by the Addition or Subtraction of any the least Part: And such are the *Ideas* of Space, Duration, and Number, which we have considered in the foregoing Chapters. 'Tis true, that we cannot but be assured, That the Great GOD, of whom, and from whom are all things, is incomprehensibly Infinite: But yet, when we apply to that first and supreme Being, our *Idea* of Infinite, in our weak and narrow Thoughts, we do it primarily in respect of his Duration and Ubiquity; and, I think, more figuratively to his Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, and other Attributes, which are properly inexhaustible and incomprehensible, &c. For when we call them Infinite, we have no other *Idea* of this Infinity,

but what carries with it some Reflection upon, and Intimation of that Number or Extent of the Acts or Objects of God's Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, which can never be supposed so great, or so many, which these Attributes will not always surmount and exceed, let us multiply them in our Thoughts, as far as we can, with all the Infinity of endless Number. I do not pretend to say how these Attributes are in GOD, who is infinitely beyond the Reach of our narrow capacities: They do, without doubt, contain in them all possible Perfection: But this, I say, is our way of conceiving them, and these our *Ideas* of their Infinity.

*The Idea of Finite easily got.*

§. 2. Finite then, and Infinite, being by the Mind look'd on as Modifications of Expansion and Duration, the next thing to be considered, is, *How the Mind comes by* them. As for the *Idea of Finite*, there is no great Difficulty. The obvious Portions of Extension, that affect our Senses, carry with them into the Mind the *Idea* of Finite: And the ordinary Periods of Succession, whereby we measure Time and Duration, as Hours, Days, and Years, are bounded Lengths. The Difficulty is, how we come by those boundless *Ideas* of *Eternity* and *Immensity*, since the Objects, which we converse with, come so much short of any Approach or Proportion to that Largeness.

*How we come by the Idea of Infinity.*

§. 3. Every one, that has any *Idea* of any stated Lengths of Space, as a Foot, finds, that he can repeat that *Idea*; and joining it to the former, make the *Idea* of two Foot; and by the Addition of a third, three Foot, and so on, without ever coming to an end of his Additions, whether of the same *Idea* of a Foot, or if he pleases of doubling it, or any other *Idea* he has of any Length, as a Mile, or Diameter of the Earth, or of the *Orbis Magnus*: For which soever of these he takes, and how often soever he doubles, or any otherwise multiplies it, he finds, that after he has continued this doubling in his Thoughts, and enlarged his *Idea*, as much as he pleases, he has no more Reason to stop, nor is one jot nearer the end of such Addition, than he was at first setting out; the Power of enlarging his *Idea* of Space by farther Additions, remaining still the same, he hence takes *Idea of infinite Space.*

*Our Idea of Space boundless.*

§. 4. This, I think, is the way, whereby the Mind gets the *Idea of infinite Space.* 'Tis a quite different Consideration to examine, whether the Mind has the *Idea* of such a *boundless Space actually existing*, since our *Ideas* are not always Proofs of

the

the Existence of Things; but yet, since this comes here in our way, I suppose I may say, that we are apt to think, that Space in it self is actually boundless, to which Imagination, the *Idea* of Space or Expansion of its self naturally leads us. For it being considered by us, either as the Extension of Body, or as existing by it self, without any solid Matter taking it up, (for of such a void Space, we have not only the *Idea*, but I have proved, as I think, from the Motion of Body, its necessary Existence,) it is impossible the Mind should be ever able to find or suppose any end of it, or be stopp'd any where in its Progress in this Space, how far soever it extends its Thoughts. Any Bounds made with Body, even Adamantine Walls, are so far from putting a stop to the Mind in its farther Progress in Space and Extension, that it rather facilitates and enlarges it: For so far as that Body reaches, so far no one can doubt of Extension; and when we are come to the utmost Extremity of Body, what is there, that can there put a stop, and satisfie the Mind, that it is at the end of Space, when it perceives it is not; nay, when it is satisfied that Body it self can move into it? For if it be necessary for the Motion of Body, that there should be an empty Space, though never so little, here amongst Bodies; and it be possible for Body to move in or through that empty Space; nay, it is impossible for any Particle of Matter to move but into an empty Space, the same Possibility of a Body's moving into a void Space, beyond the utmost Bounds of Body, as well as into a void Space interspersed amongst Bodies, will always remain clear and evident, the *Idea* of empty pure Space, whether within, or beyond the Confines of all Bodies, being exactly the same, differing not in Nature, though in Bulk; and there being nothing to hinder Body from moving into it; So that where-ever the Mind places it self by any Thought, either amongst, or remote from all Bodies, it can, in this uniform *Idea* of Space, no-where find any Bounds, any End; and so must necessarily conclude it by the very Nature and *Idea* of each Part of it, to be actually infinite.

*And so of Duration.*

§. 5. As by the Power we find in our selves of repeating, as often as we will, any *Idea* of Space, we get the *Idea* of Immensity; so, by being able to repeat the *Idea* of any Length of Duration, we have in our Minds, with all the endless Addition of Number, we come by the *Idea* of *Eternity*. For we find in our selves, we can no more come to an end of such repeated *Ideas*, than we can come to the end of Number, which every one perceives he cannot. But here

here again 'tis another Question, quite different from our having an *Idea* of Eternity, to know whether there were *any real Being*, whose Duration has been *eternal*. And as to this, I say, He that considers something now existing, must necessarily come to something eternal. But having spoke of this in another place, I shall say here no more of it, but proceed on to some other Considerations of our *Idea* of Infinity.

*Why other* Ideas *are not capable of Infinity.*

§. 6. If it be so, that our *Idea* of Infinity be got from the Power, we observe in our selves, of repeating without end our own *Ideas*; It may be demanded, *Why we do not attribute Infinity to other* Ideas, *as well as those of Space and Duration*; since they may be as easily, and as often repeated in our Minds as the other; and yet no Body ever thinks of infinite Sweetness, or infinite Whiteness, though he can repeat the *Idea* of Sweet or White, as frequently as those of a Yard, or a Day? To which I answer, All the *Ideas*, that are considered as having Parts, and are capable of Increase by the Addition of any equal or less Parts, afford us by their Repetition the *Idea* of Infinity; because with this endless Repetition, there is continued an Enlargement, of which there can be no end. But in other *Ideas* it is not so; for to the largest *Idea* of Extension or Duration, that I at present have, the Addition of any the least Part makes an Increase; but to the perfectest *Idea* I have of the whitest Whiteness, if I add another of a less or equal Whiteness, (and of a whiter than I have, I cannot add the *Idea*,) it makes no Increase, and enlarges not my *Idea* at all; and therefore the different *Ideas* of Whiteness, *&c.* are called Degrees. For those *Ideas*, that consist of Parts, are capable of being augmented by every Addition of the least Part; but if you take the *Idea* of White, which one Parcel of Snow yielded Yesterday to your Sight, and another *Idea* of White from another Parcel of Snow you see to Day, and put them together in your Mind, they embody as it were, and run into one, and the *Idea* of Whiteness is not at all increased; and if we add a less Degree of Whiteness to a greater, we are so far from increasing, that we diminish it. Those *Ideas* that consist not of Parts, cannot be augmented to what Proportion Men please, or be stretched beyond what they have received by their Senses; but Space, Duration, and Number, being capable of Increase by Repetition, leave in the Mind an *Idea* of an endless room for more; nor can we conceive anywhere a stop to a farther Addition or Progression, and so those *Ideas* alone lead our Minds towards the Thought of Infinity.

§. 7.

§. 7. Though our *Idea* of Infinity arise from the Contemplation of Quantity, and the endless Increase the Mind is able to make in Quantity, by the repeated Additions of what Portions thereof it pleases; yet I guess we cause great Confusion in our Thoughts, when we join Infinity to any supposed *Idea* of Quantity the Mind can be thought to have, and so discourse or reason about an infinite Quantity, (*viz.*) an infinite Space, or an infinite Duration: For *our Idea of Infinity* being, as I think, *an endless growing Idea*, but the *Idea* of any Quantity the Mind has, being at that time terminated in that *Idea*, (for be it as great as it will, it can be no greater than it is,) to join Infinity to it, is to adjust a standing Measure to a growing Bulk; and therefore I think it is not an insignificant Subtilty, if I say, that we are carefully to distinguish between the *Idea* of the Infinity of Space, and the *Idea* of a Space infinite: The first is nothing but a supposed endless Progression of the Mind, over what repeated *Ideas* of Space it pleases; but to have actually in the Mind the *Idea* of a Space infinite, is to suppose the Mind already passed over, and actually to have a View of all those repeated *Ideas* of Space, which an endless Repetition can never totally represent to it, which carries in it a plain Contradiction.

*Difference between Infinity of Space, and Space infinite.*

§. 8. This, perhaps, will be a little plainer, if we consider it in Numbers. The Infinity of Numbers, to the end of whose Addition every one perceives there is no approach, easily appears to any one that reflects on it: But how clear soever this *Idea* of the Infinity of Number be, there is nothing yet more evident, than the Absurdity of the actual *Idea* of an infinite Number. Whatsoever positive *Ideas* we have in our Minds of any Space, Duration, or Number, let them be never so great, they are still finite; but when we suppose an inexhaustible Remainder, from which we remove all Bounds, and wherein we allow the Mind an endless Progression of Thought, without ever compleating the *Idea*, there we have our *Idea* of Infinity; which though it seems to be pretty clear, when we consider nothing else in it, but the Negation of an End, yet when we would frame in our Minds the *Idea* of an infinite Space or Duration, that *Idea* is very obscure, and confused, because it is made up of two Parts, very different, if not inconsistent. For let a Man frame in his Mind an *Idea* of any Space or Number, as great as he will; 'tis plain, the Mind rests and terminates in that *Idea*, which is contrary to the

*We have no Idea of infinite Space.*

the *Idea of Infinity*, which *consists in a supposed endless Progression.* And therefore, I think, it is, that we are so easily confounded, when we come to argue, and reason about infinite Space or Duration, &c. Because the Parts of such an *Idea*, not being perceived to be, as they are, inconsistent, the one side or other, always perplexes, whatever Consequences we draw from the other, as an *Idea* of Motion not passing on, would perplex any one, who should argue from such an *Idea*, which is not better than an *Idea* of Motion at rest; and such another seems to me to be the *Idea* of a Space, or (which is the same thing) a Number infinite, *i. e.* of a Space or Number, which the Mind actually has, and so views, and terminates in; and of a Space or Number, which in a constant and endless inlarging, and Progression, it can in Thought never attain to. For how large soever an *Idea* of Space I have in my Mind, it is no larger than it is that Instant that I have it, though I be capable the next Instant to double it; and so on *in infinitum*: For that alone is infinite, which has no Bounds; and that the *Idea* of Infinity, in which our Thoughts can find none.

*Number affords us the clearest* Idea *of Infinity.*

§. 9. But of all other *Ideas*, it is *Number*, as I have said, which, I think, *furnishes us with the clearest and most distinct* Idea *of Infinity*, we are capable of. For even in Space and Duration, when the Mind pursues the *Idea* of Infinity, it there makes use of the *Ideas* and Repetitions of Numbers, as of Millions of Millions of Miles, or Years, which are so many distinct *Ideas* kept best by Number from running into a confused Heap, wherein the Mind loses it self; and when it has added together as many Millions, &c. as it pleases, of known Lengths of Space or Duration, the clearest *Idea* it can get of Infinity, is the confused incomprehensible Remainder of endless addible Numbers, which affords no Prospect of Stop or Boundary.

*Our different Conception of the Infinity of Number, Duration, and Expansion.*

§. 10. It will, perhaps, give us a little farther Light into the *Idea* we have *of Infinity*, and discover to us, that it *is nothing but the Infinity of Number applied to determinate Parts*, of which we have in our Minds the distinct *Ideas*, if we consider, that Number is not generally thought by us infinite, whereas Duration and Extension are apt to be so; which arises from hence, That in Number, we are at one end as it were: For there being in Number nothing less than an Unite, we there stop, and are at an end; but in Addition, or Increase of Number, we can set no Bounds:

And

And so it is like a Line, whereof one End terminating with us, the other is extended still forwards beyond all that we can conceive; but in Space and Duration it is otherwise. For in Duration, we consider it, as if this Line of Number were extended both ways to an unconceivable, undeterminate, and infinite Length; which is evident to any one, that will but reflect on what Consideration he hath of Eternity; which, I suppose, he will find to be nothing else, but the turning this Infinity of Number both ways, *à parte ante*, and *à parte post*, as they speak. For when we would consider Eternity, *à parte ante*, what do we but, beginning from our selves, and the present time we are in, repeat in our Minds the *Ideas* of Years, or Ages, or any other assignable Portion of Duration past, with a Prospect of proceeding, in such Addition, with all the Infinity of Number; and when we would consider Eternity, *à parte post*, we just after the same Rate begin from our selves, and reckon by multiplied Periods yet to come, still extending that Line of Number, as before; and these two being put together, are that infinite Duration we call *Eternity*; which, as we turn our View either way, forwards or backwards, appears infinite, because we still turn that way the infinite End of Number, *i. e.* the Power still of adding more.

§. 11. The same happens also in Space, wherein conceiving our selves to be as it were in the Centre, we do on all sides pursue those indeterminable Lines of Number; and reckoning any way from our selves, a Yard, Mile, Diameter of the Earth, or *Orbis Magnus*, by the Infinity of Number, we add others to them, as often as we will; and having no more Reason to set Bounds to those repeated *Ideas*, than we have to set Bounds to Number, we have that indeterminable *Idea of Immensity*.

§. 12. And since in any Bulk of Matter, our Thoughts can never arrive at the utmost *Divisibility*, therefore there is an apparent Infinity to us also in that, which has the Infinity also of Number, but with this difference, That in the former Considerations of the Infinity of Space and Duration, we only use Addition of Numbers; whereas this is like the Division of an Unite into its Fractions, wherein the Mind also can proceed *in infinitum*, as well as in the former Additions, it being indeed but the Addition still of new Numbers: Though in the Addition of the one, we can have no more the positive *Idea* of a Space infinitely great, than in the Division of the other, we can have the *Idea* of a Body infinitely little; our *Idea* of Infinity being, as I may

*Infinite Divisibility.*

to

so say, a growing and fugitive *Idea*, still in a boundless Progression, that can stop no where.

*No positive Idea of infinite.*

§. 13. Though it be hard, I think, to find any one so absurd, as to say, he has the positive *Idea* of an actual infinite Number; the Infinity whereof lies only in a Power still of adding any Combination of Unites to any former Number, and that as long, and as much as one will; the like also being in the Infinity of Space and Duration, which Power leaves always to the Mind room for endless Additions; yet there be those, who imagine they have *positive* Ideas *of infinite* Duration and Space. It would, I think, be enough to destroy any such positive *Idea* of Infinite, to ask him that has it, whether he could add to it or no; which would easily shew the Mistake of such a positive *Idea*. We can, I think, have no positive *Idea* of any Space or Duration, which is not made up of, and commensurate to repeated Numbers of Feet or Yards, or Days and Years, which are the common Measures, whereof we have the *Ideas* in our Minds, and whereby we judge of the Greatness of these sort of Quantities. And therefore, since an *Idea* of infinite Space or Duration must needs be made up of infinite Parts, it can have no other Infinity, than that of Number, capable still of farther Addition; but not an actual positive *Idea* of a Number infinite. For, I think, it is evident, that the Addition of finite things together, (as are all Lengths, whereof we have the positive *Ideas*) can never otherwise produce the *Idea* of Infinite, than as Number does; which consisting of Additions of finite Unites one to another, suggests the *Idea* of Infinite, only by a Power, we find we have of still increasing the Sum, and adding more of the same kind, without coming one jot nearer the end of such Progression.

§. 14. They who would prove their *Idea of Infinite to be positive*, seem to me to do it by a pleasant Argument, taken from the Negation of an end; which being negative, the Negation of it is positive. He that considers, that the End is in Body, but the Extremity or Superficies of that Body, will not, perhaps, be forward to grant, that the End is a bare Negative: And he that perceives the End of his Pen is black or white, will be apt to think, that the End is something more than a pure Negation. Nor is it, when applied to Duration, the bare Negation of Existence, but more properly the last Moment of it. But if they will have the End to be nothing but the bare Negation of Existence, I am sure they cannot deny, but that the Beginning is the first Instant of Being, and is not by any

Body

Body conceived to be a bare Negation; and therefore by their own Argument, the *Idea* of Eternal, *à parte ante*, or of a Duration without a Beginning, is but a negative *Idea*.

§. 15. The *Idea* of Infinite, has, I confeſs, ſomething of poſitive in all thoſe things we apply to it. When we would think of infinite Space or Duration, we at firſt ſtep uſually make ſome very large *Idea*, as, perhaps, of Millions of Ages, or Miles, which poſſibly we double and multiply ſeveral times. All that we thus amaſs together in our Thoughts, is poſitive, and the Aſſemblage of a great Number of poſitive *Ideas* of Space or Duration. But what ſtill remains beyond this, we have no more a poſitive diſtinct Notion of, than a Mariner has of the depth of the Sea, where having let down a large Portion of his Sounding-line, he reaches no bottom: Whereby he knows the depth to be ſo many Fathoms, and more; but how much that more is, he hath no diſtinct Notion at all: And could he always ſupply new Line, and find the Plummet always ſink, without ever ſtopping, he would be ſomething in the Poſture of the Mind reaching after a compleat and poſitive *Idea* of Infinity. In which Caſe, let this Line be 10, or 10000 Fathoms long, it equally diſcovers what is beyond it; and gives only this confuſed, and comparative *Idea*, That this is not all, but one may yet go farther. So much as the Mind comprehends of any Space, it has a poſitive *Idea* of: But in endeavouring to make it Infinite, it being always enlarging, always advancing, the *Idea* is ſtill imperfect and incompleat. So much Space as the Mind takes a View of, in its Contemplation of Greatneſs, is a clear Picture, and poſitive in the Underſtanding: But Infinite is ſtill greater. 1. Then *the* Idea *of ſo much, is poſitive* and clear. 2. *The* Idea *of Greater, is alſo clear, but it* is but a *comparative* Idea. 3. *The* Idea *of ſo much greater, as cannot be comprehended*; and this is *plain Negative*, not Poſitive. For he has no poſitive clear *Idea* of the Largeneſs of any Extenſion, (which is that ſought for in the *Idea* of Infinite,) that has not a comprehenſive *Idea* of the Dimenſions of it: And ſuch, no Body, I think, pretends to, in what is infinite. For to ſay a Man has a poſitive clear *Idea* of any Quantity, without knowing how great it is, is as reaſonable as to ſay, He has the poſitive clear *Idea* of the Number of the Sands on the Sea-ſhore, who knows not how many they be; but only that they are more than Twenty. For juſt ſuch a perfect and poſitive *Idea* has he of an infinite Space or Duration, who ſays it is larger

*What is poſitive, what negative in our* Idea *of Infinite.*

than

than the Extent or Duration of 10, 100, 1000, or any other Number of Miles, or Years, whereof he has, or can have, a positive *Idea*; which is all the *Idea*, I think, we have of Infinite. So that what lies beyond our positive *Idea* towards Infinity, lies in Obscurity; and has the indeterminate Confusion of a Negative *Idea*, wherein I know, I neither do nor can comprehend all I would, it being too large for a finite and narrow Capacity: And that cannot but be very far from a positive compleat *Idea*, wherein the greatest part of what I would comprehend, is left out, under the undeterminate Intimation of being still greater. For to say, that having in any Quantity measured so much, or gone so far, you are not yet at the End, is only to say, that that Quantity is greater. So that the Negation of an End in any Quantity, is, in other Words, only to say, That it is bigger: And a total Negation of an End, is but the carrying this Bigger still with you, in all the Progressions your Thoughts shall make in Quantity; and adding this *Idea* of still greater, to all the *Ideas* you have, or can be supposed to have of Quantity. Now, whether such an *Idea* as that, be positive, I leave any one to consider.

*We have no positive Idea of an infinite Duration.*

§. 16. I ask those, who say they have a *positive* Idea *of Eternity*, whether their *Idea* of Duration includes in it Succession, or not? If it does not, they ought to shew the Difference of their Notion of Duration, when applied to an eternal Being, and to a finite: Since, perhaps, there may be others, as well as I, who will own to them their Weakness of Understanding in this Point; and acknowledge, That the Notion they have of Duration, forces them to conceive, That whatever has Duration, is of a longer Continuance to Day, than it was Yesterday. If to avoid Succession in eternal Existence, they recur to the *Punctum Stans* of the Schools, I suppose, they will thereby very little mend the Matter, or help us to a more clear and positive *Idea* of infinite Duration, there being nothing more inconceivable to me, than Duration without Succession. Besides, that *Punctum Stans*, if it signify any thing, being not *Quantum*, finite or infinite, cannot belong to it. But if our weak Apprehensions cannot separate Succession from any Duration whatsoever, our *Idea* of Eternity can be nothing but of infinite Succession of Moments of Duration, wherein any thing does exist; and whether any one has, or can have, a positive *Idea* of an actual infinite Number, I leave him to consider, till his infinite Number be so great, that he himself can add no more

to

to it; and as long as he can increase it, I doubt, he himself will think the *Idea* he hath of it, a little too scanty for positive Infinity.

§. 17. I think it unavoidable for every considering rational Creature, that will but examine his own, or any other Existence, to have the Notion of an eternal wise Being, who had no Beginning: And such an *Idea* of infinite Duration, I am sure I have. But this *Negation of a Beginning*, being but the Negation of a positive thing, *scarce gives* me *a positive* Idea *of Infinity*; which whenever I endeavour to extend my Thoughts to, I confess my self at a Loss, and find I cannot attain any clear Comprehension of it.

*No positive Idea of infinite Space.*

§. 18. He that thinks he has a positive *Idea* of infinite Space, will, when he considers it, find that he can *no* more have a *positive Idea* of the greatest, than he has *of the least Space*. For in this latter, which seems the easier of the two, and more within our Comprehension, we are capable only of a comparative *Idea* of Smalness, which will always be less than any one, whereof we have the positive *Idea*. All our positive *Ideas* of any Quantity, whether great or little, have always Bounds; though our comparative *Idea*, whereby we can always add to the one, and take from the other, hath no Bounds. For that which remains either great or little, not being comprehended in that positive *Idea*, which we have, lies in Obscurity: And we have no other *Idea* of it, but of the Power of enlarging the one, and diminishing the other, without ceasing. A Pestle and Mortar will as soon bring any Particle of Matter to Indivisibility, as the acutest Thought of a Mathematician: And a Surveyor may as soon with his Chain, measure out infinite *Space*, as a Philosopher, by the quickest Flight of Mind, reach it; or by thinking comprehend it, which is to have a positive *Idea* of it. He that thinks on a Cube of an Inch Diameter, as a clear and positive *Idea* of it in his Mind, and so can frame one of $\frac{1}{2}$ a $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{8}$, and so on till he has the *Idea* in his Thoughts of something very little: But yet reaches not the *Idea* of that incomprehensible Littleness, which Division can produce. What remains of Smalness, is as far from his Thoughts, as when he first began; and therefore he never comes at all to have a clear and positive *Idea* of that Smalness, which is consequent to infinite Divisibility.

*What is positive, what negative, in our* Idea *of Infinite.*

§. 19. Every one that looks towards Infinity, does, as I have said, at first Glance make some very large *Idea* of that which he applies

it to, let it be Space, or Duration; and possibly he wearies his Thoughts, by multiplying in his Mind that first large *Idea*: But yet by that he comes no nearer to the having a *positive clear Idea* of what remains, to make up a positive Infinite, than the Country-fellow had of the Water, which was yet to come, and pass the Channel of the River where he stood:

> *Rusticus expectat dum transeat amnis, at ille*
> *Labitur, & labetur in omne volubilis ævum.*

*Some think they have a positive* Idea *of Eternity, and not Space.*

§. 20. There are some I have met with, that put so much difference between infinite Duration, and infinite Space, that they persuade themselves, that they have *a positive* Idea *of Eternity*; *but* that they *have not*, nor can have any *Idea of infinite Space*. The Reason of which Mistake, I suppose to be this, That finding by a due Contemplation of Causes and Effects, that it is necessary to admit some Eternal Being, and so to consider the real Existence of that Being, as taking up, and commensurate to their *Idea* of Eternity: But on the other side, not finding it necessary, but on the contrary, apparently absurd, that Body should be infinite, they forwardly conclude, they can have no *Idea* of infinite Space, because they can have no *Idea* of infinite Matter. Which Consequence, I conceive, is very ill collected; because the Existence of Matter is no ways necessary to the Existence of Space, no more than the Existence of Motion, or the Sun, is necessary to Duration, though Duration uses to be measured by it: And I doubt not but a Man may have the *Idea* of 10000 Miles square, without any Body so big, as well as the *Idea* of 10000 Years, without any Body so old. It seems as easy to me to have the *Idea* of Space empty of Body, as to think of the Capacity of a Bushel without Corn, or the Hollow of a Nutshel without a Kernel in it: It being more necessary that there should be existing a solid Body infinitely extended, because we have an *Idea* of the Infinity of Space, than it is necessary that the World should be eternal, because we have an *Idea* of infinite Duration: And why should we think our *Idea* of infinite Space, requires the real Existence of Matter to support it, when we find, that we have as clear an *Idea* of infinite Duration to come, as we have of infinite Duration past? Though, I suppose, no Body thinks it conceivable, that any thing does, or has existed in that future Duration. Nor is it possible to join our *Idea* of future Duration, with present or past Existence,

Existence, any more than it is possible to make the *Ideas* of Yesterday, to Day, and to Morrow, to be the same; or bring Ages past and future together, and make them contemporary. But if these Men are of the Mind, That they have clearer *Ideas* of infinite Duration, than of infinite Space, because it is past doubt, that GOD has existed from all Eternity, but there is no real Matter co-extended with infinite Space: Yet those Philosophers who are of Opinion, That infinite Space is possessed by GOD's infinite Omnipresence, as well as infinite Duration by his eternal Existence, must be allowed to have as clear an *Idea* of infinite Space, as of infinite Duration; though neither of them, I think, has any *positive* Idea *of Infinity* in either Case. For whatsoever positive *Ideas* a Man has in his Mind of any Quantity, he can repeat it, and add it to the former, as easy as he can add together the *Ideas* of two Days, or two Paces, which are positive *Ideas* of Lengths he has in his Mind, and so on, as long as he pleases: Whereby, if a Man had a positive *Idea* of infinite, either Duration, or Space, he could add two Infinites together; nay, make one Infinite infinitely bigger than another, Absurdities too gross to be confuted.

*Supposed positive* Ideas *of Infinity, cause of Mistakes.*

§. 21. But yet if after all this, there be Men, who persuade themselves, that they have clear positive comprehensive *Ideas* of Infinity, 'tis fit they enjoy their Privilege: And I should be very glad (with some others, that I know, who acknowledge they have none such,) to be better informed by their Communication. For I have been hitherto apt to think, that the great and *inextricable Difficulties*, which perpetually involve all Discourses *concerning Infinity*, whether of Space, Duration, or Divisibility, have been the certain *Marks of a defect in our* Ideas *of Infinity*, and the Disproportion the Nature thereof has to the Comprehension of our narrow Capacities. For whilst Men talk and dispute of infinite Space or Duration, as if they had as compleat and positive *Ideas* of them, as they have of the Names they use for them, or as they have of a Yard, or an Hour, or any other determinate Quantity, it is no wonder, if the incomprehensible Nature of the thing, they discourse of, or reason about, leads them into Perplexities and Contradictions; and their Minds be overlaid by an Object too large and mighty to be surveyed and managed by them.

*All these* Ideas *from Sensation and Reflection.*

§. 22. If I have dwelt pretty long on the Considerations of Duration, Space, and Number; and what arises from the Contempla-

tion of them, Infinity, 'tis possibly no more than the Matter requires, there being few simple *Ideas*, whose Modes give more Exercise to the Thoughts of Men, than these do. I pretend not to treat of them in their full Latitude: It suffices to my Design, to shew, how the Mind receives them, such as they are from *Sensation* and *Reflection*; and how even the *Idea* we have of *Infinity*, how remote soever it may seem to be from any Object of Sense, or Operation of our Mind, has nevertheless, as all our other *Ideas*, its Original there. Some Mathematicians, perhaps, of advanced Speculations, may have other Ways to introduce into their Minds *Ideas* of Infinity: But this hinders not, but that they themselves, as well as all other Men, got the first *Ideas*, which they had of Infinity, from Sensation and Reflection, in the Method we have here set down.

## CHAP. XVIII.

### *Of other Simple Modes.*

*Modes of Motion.*

§. 1. THough I have in the foregoing Chapters, shewn how from simple *Ideas* taken in by Sensation, the Mind comes to extend it self even to Infinity. Which however it may, of all others, seem most remote from any sensible Perception, yet at last hath nothing in it, but what is made out of simple *Ideas*, received into the Mind by the Senses, and afterwards there put together, by the Faculty the Mind has to repeat its own *Ideas*. Though, I say, these might be Instances enough of simple Modes of the simple *Ideas* of Sensation; and suffice to shew, how the Mind comes by them: Yet I shall for Method's sake, though briefly, give an Account of some few more, and then proceed to more complex *Ideas*.

§. 2. To *slide*, *rowl*, *tumble*, *walk*, *creep*, *run*, *dance*, *leap*, *skip*, and abundance others, that might be named, are Words, which are no sooner heard, but every one, who understands *English*, has presently in his Mind distinct *Ideas*, which are all but the different Modifications of Motion. *Modes of Motion* answer those of Extension: *Swift* and *Slow* are two different *Ideas* of Motion, the Measures whereof are made of the Distances of Time and Space put together, so they are complex *Ideas* comprehending Time and Space with Motion.

§. 3.

§. 3. The like Variety have we in Sounds. Every articulate Word is a different *Modification of Sound*: By which we see, that from the Sense of Hearing by such Modifications, the Mind may be furnished with distinct *Ideas*, to almost an infinite Number. Sounds also, besides the distinct Cries of Birds and Beasts, are modified by Diversity of Notes of Different Length put together, which make that complex *Idea* call'd a *Tune*, which a Musician may have in his Mind, when he hears or makes no Sound at all, by reflecting on the *Ideas* of those Sounds, so put together silently in his own Fancy. *Modes of Sounds.*

§. 4. Those of Colours are also very various: Some we take notice of, as the different Degrees, or as they are termed, *Shades of the same Colour*. But since we very seldom make Assemblages of Colours, either for Use or Delight, but Figure is taken in also, and has its part in it, as in Painting, Weaving, Needle-works, *&c.* those which are taken notice of, do most commonly belong to mixed Modes, as being made up of *Ideas* of divers kinds, *viz.* Figure and Colour, such as *Beauty, Rainbow, &c.* *Modes of Colours.*

§. 5. All *compounded Tastes and Smells*, are also Modes made up of these simple *Ideas* of those Senses. But they being such, as generally we have no Names for, are less taken notice of, and cannot be set down in Writing; and therefore must be left without Enumeration, to the Thoughts and Experience of my Reader. *Modes of Tastes.*

§. 6. In general it may be observed, that those *simple Modes, which are considered but as different Degrees of the same simple* Idea, though they are in themselves many of them very distinct *Ideas*; yet *have ordinarily no distinct Names*, nor are much taken notice of, as distinct *Ideas*, where the difference is but very small between them. Whether Men have neglected these Modes, and given no Names to them, as wanting Measures nicely to distinguish them; or because when they were so distinguished, that Knowledge would not be of general, or necessary Use, I leave it to the Thoughts of others; it is sufficient to my Purpose to shew, that all our simple *Ideas* come to our Minds only by Sensation and Reflection; and that when the Mind has them, it can variously repeat and compound them, and so make new complex *Ideas*. But though White, Red, or Sweet, *&c.* have not been modified, or made into complex *Ideas*, by several Combinations, so as to be named, and thereby ranked into Species; yet some others of the simple *Ideas*, *viz.* those of Unity, Dura-

tion, Motion, &c. above instanced in, as also Power and Thinking have been thus modified to a great Variety of complex *Ideas*, with Names belonging to them.

*Why some Modes have, & others have not Names.*

§. 7. *The Reason whereof*, I suppose, has been this, That the great Concernment of Men being with Men one amongst another, the Knowledge of Men, and their Actions, and the signifying of them to one another, was most necessary; and therefore they made *Ideas* of Actions very nicely modified, and gave those complex *Ideas* Names, that they might the more easily record, and discourse of those things, they were daily conversant in, without long Ambages and Circumlocutions; and that the things they were continually to give and receive Information about, might be the easier and quicker understood. That this is so, and that Men in framing different complex *Ideas*, and giving them Names, have been much governed by the End of Speech in general, (which is a very short and expedite Way of conveying their Thoughts one to another) is evident in the Names, which in several Arts have been found out, and applied to several complex *Ideas* of modified Actions, belonging to their several Trades, for dispatch sake, in their Direction or Discourses about them. Which *Ideas* are not generally framed in the Minds of Men not conversant about these Operations. And thence the Words that stand for them, by the greatest part of Men of the same Language, are not understood. *V. g. Colshire*, *Drilling*, *Filtration*, *Cohobation*, are Words standing for certain complex *Ideas*, which being seldom in the Minds of any but those few, whose particular Imployments do at every turn suggest them to their Thoughts, those Names of them are not generally understood but by Smiths, and Chymists; who having framed the complex *Ideas*, which these Words stand for, and having given Names to them, or received them from others, upon hearing of these Names in Communication, readily conceive those *Ideas* in their Minds; as by *Cohobation* all the simple *Ideas* of Distilling, and the pouring the Liquor, distilled from any thing, back upon the remaining Matter, and distilling it again. Thus we see, that there are great Varieties of simple *Ideas*, as of Tastes and Smells, which have no Names; and of Modes many more. Which either not having been generally enough observed, or else not being of any great Use to be taken notice of in the Affairs and Converse of Men, they have not had Names given to them, and so pass not for Species. This we shall have Occasion hereafter to consider more at large, when we come to speak of Words.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XIX.

## *Of the Modes of Thinking.*

§. 1. WHen the Mind turns its View inwards upon its self, and contemplates its own Actions, *Thinking* is the first that occurs. In it the Mind observes a great Variety of Modifications, and from thence receives distinct *Ideas*. Thus the Perception, which actually accompanies, and is annexed to any Impression on the Body, made by an external Object, being distinct from all other Modifications of *Thinking*, furnishes the Mind with a distinct *Idea*, which we call *Sensation*; which is, as it were, the actual Entrance of any *Idea* into the Understanding by the Senses. The same *Idea*, when it again recurs without the Operation of the like Object on the external Sensory, is *Remembrance*: If it be sought after by the Mind, and with Pain and Endeavour found, and brought again in View, 'tis *Recollection*: If it be held there long under attentive Consideration, 'tis *Contemplation*: When *Ideas* float in our Mind, without any Reflection or Regard of the Understanding, it is that, which the *French* call *Resverie*; our Language has scarce a Name for it: When the *Ideas* that offer themselves, (for as I have observed in another place, whilst we are awake, there will always be a Train of *Ideas* succeeding one another in our Minds,) are taken notice of, and, as it were, registred in the Memory, it is *Attention*: When the Mind with great Earnestness, and of Choice, fixes its View on any *Idea*, considers it on all sides, and will not be called off by the ordinary Sollicitation of other *Ideas*, it is that we call *Intention*, or *Study*: Sleep, without dreaming, is Rest from all these. And *Dreaming* it self, is the having of *Ideas* (whilst the outward Senses are stopp'd, so that they receive not outward Objects with their usual Quickness,) in the Mind, not suggested by any external Objects, or known Occasion; nor under any Choice or Conduct of the Understanding at all: And whether that, which we call *Extasy*, be not dreaming with the Eyes open, I leave to be examined. *Sensation, Remembrance, Contemplation, &c.*

§. 2. These are some few Instances of those various *Modes of*

*Thinking*, which the Mind may obſerve in it ſelf, and ſo have as diſtinct *Ideas* of, as it hath of *White* and *Red*, a *Square* or a *Circle*. I do not pretend to enumerate them all, nor to treat at large of this Set of *Ideas*, which are got from *Reflection*: That would be to make a Volume. It ſuffices to my preſent Purpoſe, to have ſhewn here, by ſome few Examples, of what ſort theſe *Ideas* are, and how the Mind comes by them; eſpecially ſince I ſhall have Occaſion hereafter to treat more at large of *Reaſoning*, *Judging*, *Volition*, and *Knowledge*, which are ſome of the moſt conſiderable Operations of the Mind, and *Modes of Thinking*.

*The various Attention of the Mind in Thinking.*

§. 3. But, perhaps, it may not be an unpardonable Digreſſion, nor wholly impertinent to our preſent Deſign, if we reflect here upon *the different State of the Mind in Thinking*, which thoſe Inſtances of Attention, *Reſverie*, and Dreaming, *&c.* beforementioned, naturally enough ſuggeſt. That there are *Ideas*, ſome or other, always preſent in the Mind of a waking Man, every one's Experience convinces him; though the Mind employs it ſelf about them with ſeveral Degrees of Attention. Sometimes the Mind fixes it ſelf with ſo much Earneſtneſs on the Contemplation of ſome Objects, that it turns their *Ideas* on all ſides; remarks their Relations and Circumſtances; and views every part ſo nicely, and with ſuch Intention, that it ſhuts out all other Thoughts, and takes no notice of the ordinary Impreſſions made then on the Senſes, which at another Seaſon would produce very ſenſible Perceptions: At other times, it barely obſerves the Train of *Ideas*, that ſucceed in the Underſtanding, without directing, and purſuing any of them: And at other times, it lets them paſs almoſt quite unregarded, as faint Shadows, that make no Impreſſion.

*Hence 'tis probable that Thinking is The Action, not Eſſence of the Soul.*

§. 4. This Difference of *Intention*, and *Remiſſion* of the Mind in Thinking, with a great Variety of Degrees, between earneſt Study, and very near minding nothing at all, every one, I think, has experimented in himſelf. Trace it a little farther, and you find the Mind in Sleep, retired as it were from the Senſes, and out of the reach of thoſe Motions made on the Organs of Senſe, which at other times produce very vivid and ſenſible *Ideas*. I need not, for this, inſtance in thoſe, who ſleep out whole ſtormy Nights, without hearing the Thunder, or ſeeing the Lightning, or feeling the ſhaking of the Houſe, which are ſenſible enough to thoſe, who are waking. But in this Retirement of the Mind from

from the Senses, it often retains a yet more loose and incoherent manner of *Thinking*, which we call *Dreaming*: And last of all, sound Sleep closes the Scene quite, and puts an end to all Appearances. This, I think, almost every one has Experience of in himself, and his own Observation without Difficulty leads him thus far. That which I would farther conclude from hence, is, That since the Mind can sensibly put on, at several times, several Degrees of *Thinking*; and be sometimes even in a waking Man so remiss, as to have Thoughts dim and obscure to that Degree, that they are very little removed from none at all; and at last in the dark Retirements of sound Sleep, loses the Sight perfectly of all *Ideas* whatsoever: Since, I say, this is evidently so in Matter of Fact, and constant Experience, I ask, whether it be not probable, that *Thinking is the Action, and not the Essence of the Soul?* Since the Operations of Agents will easily admit of Intention and Remission; but the Essences of Things, are not conceived capable of any such Variation. But this by the by.

---

## CHAP. XX.

### *Of Modes of Pleasure and Pain.*

*Pleasure and Pain simple Ideas.*

§. 1. AMongst the simple *Ideas*, which we receive both from *Sensation* and *Reflection*, *Pain* and *Pleasure* are two very considerable ones. For as in the Body, there is Sensation barely in its self, or accompanied with *Pain* or *Pleasure*; so the Thought, or Perception of the Mind is simply so, or else accompanied also with *Pleasure* or *Pain*, Delight, or Trouble, call it how you please. These, like other simple *Ideas*, cannot be described, nor their Names defined; the Way of knowing them, is, as of the simple *Ideas* of the Senses, only by Experience. For to define them by the presence of Good or Evil, is no otherwise to make them known to us, than by making us reflect on what we feel in our selves, upon the several and various Operations of Good and Evil upon our Minds, as they are differently applied to, or considered by us.

*Good and Evil, what.*

§. 2. Things then are Good or Evil, only in Reference to Pleasure or Pain. That we call *Good*, which

which *is apt to cause or increase Pleasure, or diminish Pain in us; or else to procure, or preserve us the Possession of any other Good, or Absence of any Evil.* And on the contrary, we name that *Evil*, which *is apt to produce or increase any Pain, or diminish any Pleasure in us; or else to procure us any Evil, or deprive us of any Good.* By Pleasure and Pain, I must be understood to mean of Body or Mind, as they are commonly distinguished; though in Truth, they be only different Constitutions of the Mind, sometimes occasioned by Disorder in the Body, sometimes by Thoughts of the Mind.

*Our Passions moved by Good and Evil.*

§. 3. *Pleasure* and *Pain*, and that which causes them, Good and Evil, are the Hinges on which our *Passions* turn: And if we reflect on our selves, and observe how these, under various Considerations, operate in us; what Modifications or Tempers of Mind, what internal Sensations (if I may so call them,) they produce in us, we may thence form to our selves the *Ideas* of our *Passions*.

*Love.*

§. 4. Thus any one reflecting upon the Thought he has of the Delight, which any present, or absent thing is apt to produce in him, has the *Idea* we call *Love*. For when a Man declares in Autumn, when he is eating them, or in Spring, when there are none, that he *loves* Grapes, it is no more, but that the Taste of Grapes delights him; let an Alteration of Health or Constitution destroy the Delight of their Taste, and he then can be said to *love* Grapes no longer.

*Hatred.*

§. 5. On the contrary, the Thought of the Pain, which any thing present or absent is apt to produce in us, is what we call *Hatred*. Were it my Business here, to enquire any farther than into the bare *Ideas* of our Passions, as they depend on different Modifications of Pleasure and Pain, I should remark, that our *Love* and *Hatred* of inanimate insensible Beings, is commonly founded on that Pleasure and Pain which we receive from their Use and Application any way to our Senses, though with their Destruction: But *Hatred* or *Love*, to Beings capable of Happiness or Misery, is often the Uneasiness or Delight, which we find in our selves arising from a Consideration of their very Being, or Happiness. Thus the Being and Welfare of a Man's Children or Friends, producing constant Delight in him, he is said constantly to *love* them. But it suffices to note, that our *Ideas* of *Love* and *Hatred*, are but the Dispositions of the Mind, in respect

pect of Pleasure and Pain in general, however caused in us.

§. 6. The Uneasiness a Man finds in himself upon the Absence of any thing, whose present Enjoyment carries the *Idea* of Delight with it, is that we call *Desire*, which is greater or less, as that Uneasiness is more or less vehement. Where, by the by, it may perhaps be of some Use to remark, that the chief, if not only Spur to Human Industry and Action, is Uneasiness. For whatever Good is propos'd, if its Absence carries no Displeasure nor Pain with it; if a Man be easie and content without it, there is no Desire of it, nor Endeavour after it; there is no more but a bare *Velleity*, the Term used to signifie the lowest Degree of Desire, and that which is next to none at all, when there is so little Uneasiness in the Absence of any thing, that it carries a Man no farther than some faint Wishes for it, without any more effectual or vigorous Use of the Means to attain it. *Desire* also is stopp'd or abated by the Opinion of the Impossibility or Unattainableness of the Good propos'd, as far as the Uneasiness is cured or allay'd by that Consideration. This might carry our Thoughts farther, were it seasonable in this place. *Desire.*

§. 7. *Joy* is a Delight of the Mind, from the Consideration of the present or assured approaching Possession of a Good; and we are then possessed of any Good, when we have it so in our Power, that we can use it when we please. Thus a Man almost starved, as *Joy* at the Arrival of Relief, even before he has the Pleasure of using it: And a Father, in whom the very Well-being of his Children causes Delight, is always, as long as his Children are in such a State, in the Possession of that Good; for he needs but to reflect on it to have that Pleasure. *Joy.*

§. 8. *Sorrow* is Uneasiness in the Mind, upon the Thought of a Good lost, which might have been enjoy'd longer; or the Sense of a present Evil. *Sorrow.*

§. 9. *Hope* is that Pleasure in the Mind, which every one finds in himself, upon the Thought of a profitable future Enjoyment of a thing, which is apt to delight him. *Hope.*

§. 10. *Fear* is an Uneasiness of the Mind, upon the Thought of future Evil likely to befal us. *Fear.*

§. 11. *Despair* is the Thought of the Unattainableness of any Good, which works differently in Mens Minds, sometimes producing Uneasiness or Pain, sometimes Rest and Indolency. *Despair.*

§. 12.

*Anger.* §. 12. *Anger* is Uneasiness or Disompoſure of the Mind, upon the Receipt of any Injury, with a preſent Purpoſe of Revenge.

*Envy.* §. 13. *Envy* is an Uneaſineſs of Mind, cauſed by the Conſideration of a Good we deſire, obtained by one, we think ſhould not have had it before us.

*What Paſſions all Men have.* §. 14. Theſe two laſt, *Envy* and *Anger*, not being cauſed by Pain and Pleaſure ſimply in themſelves, but having in them ſome mixed Conſiderations of our ſelves and others, are not therefore to be found in all Men, becauſe thoſe other Parts of valuing their Merits, or intending Revenge, is wanting in them: But all the reſt terminated purely in Pain and Pleaſure, are, I think, to be found in all Men. For we *love*, *deſire*, *rejoice*, and *hope*, only in reſpect of Pleaſure; we *hate*, *fear*, and *grieve* only in reſpect of Pain ultimately: In fine, all theſe Paſſions are moved by things, only as they appear to be the Cauſes of Pleaſure and Pain, or to have Pleaſure or Pain ſome way or other annexed to them. Thus we extend our Hatred uſually to the Subject, (at leaſt if a ſenſible or voluntary Agent,) which has produced Pain in us, becauſe the Fear it leaves, is a conſtant Pain: But we do not ſo conſtantly love what has done us Good; becauſe Pleaſure operates not ſo ſtrongly on us, as Pain; and becauſe we are not ſo ready to have hope, it will do ſo again. But this by the by.

*Pleaſure and Pain, what.* §. 15. By *Pleaſure and Pain*, Delight and Uneaſineſs, I muſt all along be underſtood (as I have above intimated) to mean, not only bodily Pain and Pleaſure, but whatſoever *Delight* or *Uneaſineſs* is felt by us, whether ariſing from any grateful, or unacceptable Senſation or Reflection.

§. 16. 'Tis farther to be conſidered, That in Reference to the Paſſions, the removal or *leſſening of a Pain is* conſidered, and operates as a *Pleaſure*: And the loſs or diminiſhing of a Pleaſure, as a Pain.

*Shame.* §. 17. The Paſſions too have moſt of them in moſt Perſons Operations on the Body, and cauſe various Changes in it: Which not being always ſenſible, do not make a neceſſary Part of the *Idea* of each Paſſion. For *Shame*, which is an Uneaſineſs of the Mind, upon the Thought of having done ſomething, which is indecent, or will leſſen the valued Eſteem which others have for us, has not always bluſhing accompanying it.

§. 18.

§. 18. I would not be mistaken here, as if I meant this as a Discourse of the *Passions*; they are *many more than those* I have here named: And those I have taken notice of, would each of them require a much larger, and more accurate Discourse. I have only mentioned these here, as so many Instances of Modes of Pleasure and Pain resulting in our Minds, from various Considerations of Good and Evil. I might, perhaps, have instanced in other Modes of Pleasure and Pain more simple than these, as the Pain of *Hunger* and *Thirst*, and the Pleasure of Eating and Drinking to remove them; The Pain of tender Eyes, and the Pleasure of Musick; Pain from captious uninstructive Wrangling, and the Pleasure of rational Conversation with a Friend, or of well-directed Study in the Search and Discovery of Truth. But the Passions being of much more Concernment to us, I rather made choice to instance in them, and shew how the *Ideas* we have of them, are derived from Sensation and Reflection.

*These Instances to shew how our* Ideas *of the Passions are got from Sensation and Reflection.*

---

# CHAP. XXI.

## *Of Power.*

§. 1. THE Mind being every Day informed, by the Senses, of the Alteration of those simple *Ideas*, it observes in things without; and taking notice how one comes to an end, and ceases to be, and another begins to exist, which was not before; reflecting also on what passes within it self, and observing a constant Change of its *Ideas*, sometimes by the Impression of outward Objects on the Senses, and sometimes by the Determination of its own Choice; and concluding from what it has so constantly observed to have been, that the like Changes will for the future be made, in the same things, by like Agents, and by the like Ways, considers in one thing the Possibility of having any of its simple *Ideas* changed, and in another the Possibility of making that Change; and so comes by that *Idea* which we call *Power*. Thus we say, Fire has a *Power* to melt Gold, *i.e.* to destroy the Consistency of its insensible Parts, and consequently its Hardness, and make it fluid; and Gold has a *Power* to be

*This* Idea *how got.*

be melted: That the Sun has a *Power* to blanch Wax, and Wax a *Power* to be blanched by the Sun, whereby the Yellowneſs is deſtroy'd, and Whiteneſs made to exiſt in its room. In which, and the like Caſes, the *Power* we conſider, is in reference to the Change of perceivable *Ideas*. For we cannot obſerve any Alteration to be made in, or Operation upon any thing, but by the obſervable Change of its ſenſible *Ideas*; nor conceive any Alteration to be made, but by conceiving a Change of ſome of its *Ideas*.

*Power active and paſſive.*

§. 2. *Power* thus conſidered, is two-fold, *viz.* as able to make, or able to receive any Change: The one may be call'd *Active*, and the other *Paſſive Power*. Whether Matter be not wholly deſtitute of *Active Power*, as its Author GOD is truly above all *paſſive Power*; and whether the intermediate State of created Spirits be not that alone, which is capable of both *active* and *paſſive Power*, may be worth Conſideration. I ſhall not now enter into that Enquiry, my preſent Buſineſs being not to ſearch into the Original of Power, but how we come by the *Idea* of it. But ſince *active Powers* make ſo great a part of our complex *Ideas* of natural Subſtances, (as we ſhall ſee hereafter,) and I mention them as ſuch, according to common Apprehenſion; yet they being not, perhaps, ſo truly *active Powers*, as our haſty Thoughts are apt to repreſent them, I judge it not amiſs, by this Intimation, to direct our Minds to the Conſideration of GOD and Spirits, for the cleareſt *Idea* of *active Power*.

*Power includes Relation.*

§. 3. I confeſs *Power includes in it ſome kind of Relation*, (a Relation to Action or Change,) as indeed which of our *Ideas*, of what kind ſoever, when attentively conſidered, does not? For our *Ideas* of Extenſion, Duration, and Number, do they not all contain in them a ſecret Relation of the Parts? Figure and Motion have ſomething relative in them much more viſibly: And ſenſible Qualities, as Colours and Smells, *&c.* what are they but the *Powers* of different Bodies, in relation to our Perception? *&c.* And if conſidered in the things themſelves, do they not depend on the Bulk, Figure, Texture, and Motion of the Parts? All which include ſome kind of Relation in them. Our *Idea* therefore of *Power*, I think, may well have a place amongſt other ſimple *Ideas*, and be conſidered as one of them, being one of thoſe, that make a principal Ingredient in our complex *Ideas* of Subſtances, as we ſhall hereafter have occaſion to obſerve.

§. 4.

§. 4. We are abundantly furnished with the *Idea* of *passive Power*, by almost all sorts of sensible things. In most of them we cannot avoid observing their sensible Qualities, nay, their very Substances to be in a continual Flux: And therefore with Reason we look on them as liable still to the same Change. Nor have we of *active Power* (which is the more proper Signification of the Word *Power*) fewer Instances. Since whatever Change is observed, the Mind must collect a Power somewhere, able to make that Change, as well as a Possibility in the thing it self to receive it. But yet, if we will consider it attentively, Bodies, by our Senses, do not afford us so clear and distinct an *Idea* of *active Power*, as we have from Reflection on the Operations of our Minds. For all *Power* relating to Action, and there being but two sorts of Action, whereof we have any *Idea*, *viz.* Thinking and Motion, let us consider whence we have the clearest *Ideas* of the *Powers*, which produce these Actions. 1. Of Thinking, Body affords us no *Idea* at all, it is only from Reflection that we have that. 2. Neither have we from Body any *Idea* of the beginning of Motion. A Body at rest affords us no *Idea* of any *active Power* to move; and when it is set in Motion it self, that Motion is rather a Passion, than an Action in it. For when the Ball obeys the Stroke of a Billiard-stick, it is not any Action of the Ball, but bare Passion: Also when by Impulse it sets another Ball in Motion, that lay in its way, it only communicates the Motion it had received from another, and loses in it self so much, as the other received; which gives us but a very obscure *Idea* of an *active Power* of moving in Body, whilst we observe it only to transfer, but not produce any Motion. For it is but a very obscure *Idea* of *Power*, which reaches not the Production of the Action, but the Continuation of the Passion. For so is Motion, in a Body impelled by another: The Continuation of the Alteration made in it from Rest to Motion being little more an Action than the Continuation of the Alteration of its Figure by the same Blow, is an Action. The *Idea* of the beginning of Motion, we have only from Reflection on what passes in our selves, where we find by Experience, that barely by willing it, barely by a Thought of the Mind, we can move the Parts of our Bodies, which were before at rest. So that it seems to me, we have from the Observation of the Operation of Bodies by our Senses, but a very imperfect obscure *Idea* of *active Power*, since they afford us not any *Idea* in themselves of the *Power* to begin any Action,

*The clearest Idea of active Power had from Spirit.*

Action, either Motion or Thought. But if, from the Impulse, Bodies are observed to make one upon another, any one thinks he has a clear *Idea* of *Power*, it serves as well to my Purpose, *Sensation* being one of those Ways, whereby the Mind comes by its *Ideas*: Only I thought it worth while to consider here by the way, whether the Mind doth not receive its *Idea* of *active Power* clearer from Reflection on its own Operations, than it doth from any external Sensation.

*Will and Understanding, two Powers.*

§. 5. This at least I think evident, That we find in our selves a *Power* to begin or forbear, continue or end several Actions of our Minds, and Motions of our Bodies, barely by a Thought or Preference of the Mind ordering, or, as it were, commanding the doing or not doing such or such a particular Action. This *Power* which the Mind has, thus to order the Consideration of any *Idea*, or the forbearing to consider it; or to prefer the Motion of any part of the Body to its Rest, and *vice versa* in any particular Instance, is that which we call the *Will*. The actual Exercise of that Power, by directing any particular Action, or its Forbearance, is that which we call *Volition* or *Willing*. The Forbearance of that Action, consequent to such Order or Command of the Mind, is called *Voluntary*. And whatsoever Action is performed without such a Thought of the Mind, is called *Involuntary*. The Power of Perception is that which we call the *Understanding*. Perception, which we make the Act of the Understanding, is of three sorts: 1. The Perception of *Ideas* in our Minds. 2. The Perception of the Signification of Signs. 3. The Perception of the Connexion or Repugnancy, Agreement or Disagreement, that there is between any of our *Ideas*. All these are attributed to the *Understanding*, or perceptive Power, though it be the two latter only that Use allows us to say we understand.

*Faculties.*

§. 6. These Powers of the Mind, *viz.* of *Perceiving*, and of *Preferring*, are usually call'd by another Name: And the ordinary way of Speaking is, That the *Understanding* and *Will* are two *Faculties* of the Mind; a Word proper enough, if it be used as all Words should be, so as not to breed any Confusion in Mens Thoughts, by being supposed (as I suspect it has been) to stand for some real Beings in the Soul, that performed those Actions of Understanding and Volition. For when we say, the *Will* is the commanding and superior Faculty of the Soul; that it is, or is not free; that it determines the inferior Faculties; that it follows the Dictates

Dictates of the *Understanding*, &c. though these, and the like Expressions, by those that carefully attend to their own *Ideas*, and conduct their Thoughts more by the Evidence of Things, than the Sound of Words, may be understood in a clear and distinct Sense: Yet I suspect, I say, that this way of Speaking of *Faculties*, has misled many into a confused Notion of so many distinct Agents in us, which had their several Provinces and Authorities, and did command, obey, and perform several Actions, as so many distinct Beings; which has been no small Occasion of Wrangling, Obscurity, and Uncertainty in Questions relating to them.

*Whence the Ideas of Liberty and Necessity.*

§. 7. Every one, I think, finds in himself a *Power* to begin or forbear, continue or put an end to several Actions in himself. From the Consideration of the Extent of this Power of the Mind over the Actions of the Man, which every one finds in himself, arise the *Ideas* of *Liberty* and *Necessity*.

*Liberty, what.*

§. 8. All the Actions, that we have any *Idea* of, reducing themselves, as has been said, to these two, *viz.* Thinking and Motion, so far as a Man has a Power to think, or not to think; to move, or not to move, according to the Preference or Direction of his own Mind, so far is a Man *free*. Where ever any Performance or Forbearance are not equally in a Man's Power; where ever doing or not doing, will not equally follow upon the Preference of his Mind directing it, there he is not *free*, though perhaps the Action may be voluntary. So that the *Idea* of *Liberty*, is the *Idea* of a Power in any Agent to do or forbear any particular Action, according to the Determination or Thought of the Mind, whereby either of them is preferr'd to the other; where either of them is not in the Power of the Agent to be produced by him according to his *Volition*, there he is not at *Liberty*, that Agent is under *Necessity*. So that *Liberty* cannot be, where there is no Thought, no Volition, no Will; but there may be Thought, there may be Will, there may be Volition, where there is no *Liberty*. A little Consideration of an obvious Instance or two, may make this clear.

*Supposes the Understanding, and Will.*

§. 9. A Tennis ball, whether in Motion, by the Stroke of a Racket, or lying still at rest, is not by any one taken to be a *free Agent*. If we enquire into the Reason, we shall find it is, because we conceive not a Tennis-ball to think, and consequently not to have any Volition, or Preference of Motion to Rest,

or *vice versâ*; and therefore has not *Liberty*, is not a free Agent; but all is both Motion and Reſt, come under our *Idea* of *Neceſſary*, and are ſo call'd. Likewiſe a Man falling into the Water, (a Bridge breaking under him,) has not herein Liberty, is not a free Agent. For though he has Volition, though he prefers his not falling to falling; yet the Forbearance of that Motion not being in his Power, the Stop or Ceſſation of that Motion follows not upon his Volition; and therefore therein he is not *free*. So a Man ſtriking himſelf, or his Friend, by a Convulſive Motion of his Arm, which it is not in his Power, by Volition or the Direction of his Mind to ſtop, or forbear; no Body thinks he has in this *Liberty*; every one pities him, as acting by Neceſſity and Conſtraint.

*Belongs not to Volition.*

§. 10. Again, ſuppoſe a Man be carried, whilſt faſt aſleep, into a Room, where is a Perſon he longs to ſee and ſpeak with; and be there locked faſt in, beyond his Power to get out; he awakes, and is glad to find himſelf in ſo deſirable Company, which he ſtays willingly in, *i. e.* prefers his ſtay to going away. I ask, Is not this ſtay voluntary? I think, no Body will doubt it; and yet being locked faſt in, 'tis evident he is not at Liberty not to ſtay, he has not Freedom to be gone. So that *Liberty is not an* Idea *belonging to Volition*, or preferring; but to the Perſon having the Power of doing, or forbearing to do, according as the Mind ſhall chuſe or direct. Our *Idea* of Liberty reaches as far as that Power, and no farther. For where ever Reſtraint comes to check that Power, or Compulſion takes away that Indifferency of Ability on either ſide to act, or to forbear acting, there *Liberty*, and our Notion of it, preſently ceaſes.

*Voluntary oppoſed to Involuntary, not to Neceſſary.*

§. 11. We have Inſtances enough, and often more than enough in our own Bodies. A Man's Heart beats, and the Blood circulates, which 'tis not in his Power by any Thought or Volition to ſtop; and therefore in reſpect of theſe Motions, where Reſt depends not on his Choice, nor would follow the Determination of his Mind, if it ſhould prefer it, he is not a *free Agent*. Convulſive Motions agitate his Legs, ſo that though he *wills* it never ſo much, he cannot by any Power of his Mind ſtop their Motion, (as in that odd Diſeaſe called *Chorea Sancti Viti*,) but he is perpetually dancing: He is not at Liberty in this Action, but under as much Neceſſity of moving, as a Stone that falls, or a Tennis-ball ſtruck with a Racket. On the other ſide, a Palſie or the Stocks hinder his

Legs

Legs from obeying the Determination of his Mind, if it would thereby transfer his Body to another Place. In all these there is want of *Freedom*, though the sitting still even of a Paralytick, whilst he prefers it to a Removal, is truly voluntary. *Voluntary* then *is not opposed to Necessary*; *but to Involuntary*. For a Man may prefer what he can do, to what he cannot do; the State he is in, to its Absence or Change, though Necessity has made it in it self unalterable.

*Liberty what.*

§. 12. As it is in the Motions of the Body, so it is in the Thoughts of our Minds; where any one is such, that we have Power to take it up, or lay it by, according to the Preference of the Mind, there we are *at Liberty*. A waking Man being under the Necessity of having some *Ideas* constantly in his Mind, is not at *Liberty* to think, or not to think; no more than he is at *Liberty*, whether his Body shall touch any other, or no: But whether he will remove his Contemplation from one *Idea* to another, is many times in his Choice; and then he is in respect of his *Ideas*, as much at *Liberty*, as he is in respect of Bodies he rests on: He can at Pleasure remove himself from one to another. But yet some *Ideas* to the Mind, like some Motions to the Body, are such, as in certain Circumstances it cannot avoid, nor obtain their Absence by the utmost Effort it can use. A Man on the Rack, is not at *Liberty* to lay by the *Idea* of Pain, and divert himself with other Contemplations: And sometimes a boisterous Passion hurries our Thoughts, as a Hurricane does our Bodies, without leaving us the Liberty of thinking on other things, which we would rather chuse. But as soon as the Mind regains the Power to stop or continue, begin or forbear any of these Motions of the Body without, or Thoughts within, according as it thinks fit to prefer either to the other, we then consider the Man as a *free Agent* again.

*Necessity, what.*

§. 13. Where-ever Thought is wholly wanting, or the Power to act or forbear according to the Direction of Thought, there *Necessity* takes place. This in an Agent capable of Volition, when the Beginning or Continuation of any Action is contrary to that Preference of his Mind, is called *Compulsion*; when the hind'ring or stopping any Action is contrary to his Volition, it is called *Restraint*. Agents that have no Thought, no Volition at all, are in every thing *necessary* Agents.

*Liberty belongs not to the Will.*

§. 14. If this be so, (as I imagine it is,) I leave it to be considered, whether it may not

help to put an end to that long agitated, and, I think, unreasonable, because unintelligible, Question, *viz.* *Whether Man's Will be free, or no?* For if I mistake not, it follows, from what I have said, that the Question it self is altogether improper; and it is as insignificant to ask, whether Man's *Will* be free, as to ask, whether his Sleep be swift, or his Vertue square: *Liberty* being as little applicable to the *Will*, as Swiftness of Motion is to Sleep, or Squareness to Vertue. Every one would laugh at the Absurdity of such a Question, as either of these; because it is obvious, that the Modifications of Motion belong not to Sleep, nor the Difference of Figure to Vertue: And when any one well considers it, I think he will as plainly perceive, that *Liberty*, which is but a Power, belongs only to Agents, and cannot be an Attribute or Modification of the *Will*, which is also but a Power.

*Volition.*

§. 15. Such is the Difficulty of explaining, and giving clear Notions of internal Actions by Sounds, that I must here warn my Reader that *Ordering*, *Directing*, *Chusing*, *Preferring*, &c. which I have made use of, will not distinctly enough express *Volition*, unless he will reflect on what he himself does, whe he *wills*. For Example, *Preferring* which seems perhaps best to express the Act of *Volition*, does it not precisely. For though a Man would prefer flying to walking, yet who can say he ever *wills* it? *Volition*, 'tis plain, is an Act of the Mind knowingly exerting that Dominion it takes it self to have over any part of the Man, by imploying it in, or with-holding it from any particular Action. And what is the *Will*, but the Faculty to do this? And is that Faculty any thing more in Effect, than a Power, the Power of the Mind to determine its Thought, to the producing, continuing, or stopping any Action, as far as it depends on us? For can it be denied, that whatever Agent has a Power to think on its own Actions, and to prefer their doing or omission either to other, has that Faculty call'd *Will*? *Will* then is nothing but such a Power. *Liberty*, on the other side, is the Power a Man has to do or forbear doing any particular Action, according as its doing or forbearance has the actual preference in the Mind, which is the same thing as to say, according as he himself *wills* it.

*Powers belong to Agents.*

§. 16. 'Tis plain then, That the *Will* is nothing but one Power or Ability, and *Freedom* another Power or Ability: So that to ask, whether the *Will has Freedom*, is to ask, whether one Power has another Power, one Ability another Ability;

Ability; a Question at first sight too grosly absurd to make a Dispute, or need an Answer. For who is it that sees not, that *Powers* belong only to *Agents*, and *are Attributes only of Substances, and not of Powers* themselves? So that this way of putting the Question, *viz.* Whether the *Will be free?* is in Effect to ask, Whether the *Will* be a Substance, an Agent? or at least to suppose it, since Freedom can properly be attributed to nothing else. If Freedom can with any Propriety of Speech be applied to Power, it may be attributed to the Power that is in a Man, to produce, or forbear producing Motions in parts of his Body, by Choice or Preference; which is that which denominates him free, and is Freedom it self. But if any one should ask, whether Freedom were free, he would be suspected not to understand well what he said; and he would be thought to deserve *Midas*'s Ears, who knowing that Rich was a Denomination from the Possession of Riches, should demand whether Riches themselves were Rich.

§. 17. However the *name Faculty*, which Men have given to this Power call'd the *Will*, and whereby they have been led into a way of talking of the *Will* as acting, may, by an Appropriation that disguises its true Sense, serve a little to palliate the Absurdity; yet the *Will* in truth, signifies nothing but a Power, or Ability, to prefer or chuse: And when the *Will*, under the Name of a *Faculty*, is considered, as it is, barely as an Ability to do something, the Absurdity, in saying it is free, or not free, will easily discover it self. For if it be reasonable to suppose and talk of *Faculties*, as distinct Beings, that can act, (as we do, when we say the *Will* orders, and the *Will* is free,) 'tis fit that we should make a speaking *Faculty*, and a walking *Faculty*, and a dancing *Faculty*, by which those Actions are produced, which are but several Modes of Motion; as well as we make the *Will* and *Understanding* to be *Faculties*, by which the Actions of Chusing and Perceiving are produced, which are but several Modes of Thinking: And we may as properly say, that 'tis the singing *Faculty* sings, and the dancing *Faculty* dances; as that the *Will* chuses, or that the Understanding conceives; or, as is usual, that the *Will* directs the Understanding, or the Understanding obeys, or obeys not the *Will*: It being altogether as proper and intelligible to say, that the Power of Speaking directs the Power of Singing, or the Power of Singing obeys or disobeys the Power of Speaking.

§. 18. This way of talking, nevertheless, as prevailed, and, as I guess, produced great Confusion. For these being all dif-

ferent Powers in the Mind, or in the Man, to do several Actions, he exerts them as he thinks fit: But the Power to do one Action, is not operated on by the Power of doing another Action. For the Power of Thinking operates not on the Power of Chusing, nor the Power of Chusing on the Power of Thinking; no more than the Power of Dancing operates on the Power of Singing, or the Power of Singing on the Power of Dancing, as any one, who reflects on it, will easily perceive: and yet this is it, which we say, when we thus speak, that *the Will operates on the Understanding, or the Understanding on the Will.*

§. 19. I grant, that this or that actual Thought, may be the Occasion of Volition, or exercising the Power a Man has to chuse; or the actual Choice of the Mind, the Cause of actual thinking on this or that thing: As the actual singing of such a Tune, may be the Occasion of dancing such a Dance, and the actual dancing of such a Dance, the Occasion of singing such a Tune. But in all these, it is not one *Power* that operates on another: But it is the Mind that operates, and exerts these Powers; it is the Man that does the Action, it is the Agent that has Power, or is able to do. For *Powers* are Relations, not Agents: And *that which has the Power, or not the Power to operate, is that alone, which is, or is not free*, and not the Power it self: For Freedom, or not Freedom, can belong to nothing, but what has, or has not a Power to act.

*Liberty belongs not to the Will.*

§. 20. The attributing to *Faculties*, that which belonged not to them, has given Occasion to this way of talking: But the introducing into Discourses concerning the Mind, with the Name of *Faculties*, a Notion of their operating, has, I suppose, as little advanced our Knowledge in that part of our selves, at the great use and mention of the like Invention of *Faculties*, in the Operations of the Body, has helped us in the Knowledge of Physick. Not that I deny there are *Faculties*, both in the Body and Mind: They both of them have their *Powers* of Operating, else neither the one nor the other could operate. For nothing can operate, that is not able to operate; and that is not able to operate, that has no *Power* to operate. Nor do I deny, that those Words, and the like, are to have their place in the common Use of Languages, that have made them currant. It looks like too much Affectation wholly to lay them by: And Philosophy it self, though it likes not a gaudy Dress, yet when it appears in publick, must have so much Complacency, as to be cloathed in the ordinary Fashion and Language of the Country,

try, so far as it can consist with Truth and Perspicuity. But the Fault has been, that Faculties have been spoken of, and represented, as so many distinct Agents. For it being asked, what it was that digested the Meat in our Stomachs? It was a ready, and very satisfactory Answer, to say, That it was the *digestive Faculty*. What was it that made any thing come out of the Body? The *expulsive Faculty*. What moved? The *Motive Faculty*: And so in the Mind, the *intellectual Faculty*, or the Understanding, understood; and the *elective Faculty*, or the Will, willed or commanded: Which is in short to say, That the Ability to digest, digested; and the Ability to move, moved; and the Ability to understand, understood. For *Faculty*, *Ability*, and *Power*, I think, are but different Names of the same things: Which ways of speaking, when put into more intelligible Words, will, I think, amount to thus much; That Digestion is performed by something that is able to digest; Motion by something able to move; and Understanding by something able to understand. And in truth it would be very strange, if it should be otherwise; as strange as it would be for a Man to be free without being able to be free.

§. 21. To return then to the Enquiry about Liberty, I think *the Question is not proper, whether the Will be free, but whether a Man be free.* Thus, I think,

*But to the Agent or Man.*

1. That so far as any one can, by the Direction or Choice of his Mind, preferring the Existence of any Action, to the Non-existence of that Action, and *vice versâ*, make it to exist, or not exist, so far he is *free*. For if I can, by a Thought, directing the Motion of my Finger, make it move, when it was at rest, or *vice versâ*, 'tis evident, that in respect of that, I am free; and if I can, by a like Thought of my Mind, preferring one to the other, produce either Words, or Silence, I am at liberty to speak, or hold my peace; and *as far as this Power reaches, of acting, or not acting, by the Determination of his own Thought preferring either, so far is a Man free.* For how can we think any one freer, than to have the Power to do what he will? And so far as any one can, by preferring any Action to its not being, or Rest to any Action, produce that Action or Rest, so far can he do what he will. For such a preferring of Action to its absence, is the willing of it; and we can scarce tell how to imagine any *Being* freer, than to be able to do what he *wills*. So that in respect of Action, within the reach of such a Power in him, a Man seems as free, as 'tis possible for Freedom to make him.

*In respect of Willing, a Man is not free.*

§. 22. But the inquisitive Mind of Man, willing to shift off from himself, as far as he can, all Thoughts of Guilt, though it be by putting himself into a worse State, than that of fatal Necessity, is not content with this: Freedom, unless it reaches farther than this, will not serve the turn: And it passes for a good Plea, that a Man is not free at all, if he be not as free to will, as he is to act, what he wills. Concerning a Man's Liberty, there yet therefore is raised this farther Question, *Whether a Man be free to will*; which, I think, is what is meant, when it is disputed, Whether the *Will* be free. And as to that I imagine,

§. 23. 2. That *Willing*, or *Volition* being an Action, and Freedom consisting in a Power of acting, or not acting, *a Man in respect of willing, or the Act of Volition, when any Action in his Power is once proposed to his Thoughts, as presently to be done, cannot be free.* The Reason whereof is very manifest: For it being unavoidable that the Action depending on his *Will*, should exist, or not exist; and its Existence, or not Existence, following perfectly the Determination, and Preference of his Will, he cannot avoid willing the Existence, or not Existence of that Action; it is absolutely necessary that he *will* the one, or the other, *i. e. prefer* the one to the other; since one of them must necessarily follow; and that which does follow, follows by the Choice and Determination of his Mind, that is, by his *Willing it*: For if he did not *will* it, it would not be. So that in respect of the Act of *Willing*, a Man in such Case is not free: Liberty consisting in a Power to act, or not to act, which, in regard of Volition, a Man upon such a Proposal, has not. For it is unavoidably necessary to prefer the doing, or forbearance, of an Action in a Man's Power, which is once so proposed to his Thoughts; a Man must necessarily *will* the one, or the other of them, upon which Preference, or Volition, the Action, or its forbearance, certainly follows, and is truly voluntary: But the Act of Volition, or preferring one of the two, being that which he cannot avoid, a Man in respect of that Act of *Willing*, is under a Necessity, and so cannot be free; unless Necessity and Freedom can consist together, and a Man can be free and bound at once.

§. 24. This then is evident, That in all Proposals of present Action, *a Man is not at liberty to will, or not to will, because he can forbear willing*: Liberty consisting in a Power to act, or to forbear acting, and in that only. For a Man that sits still, is said yet to be at Liberty, because he can walk if he *wills* it.

But

But if a Man sitting still has not a Power to remove himself, he is not at Liberty; so likewise a Man falling down a Precipice, though in Motion, is not at Liberty, because he cannot stop that Motion, if he would. This being so, 'tis plain that a Man that is walking, to whom it is proposed to give of walking, is not at Liberty, whether he *will* determine himself to walk, or give off walking, or no: He must necessarily prefer one, or t'other of them; walking or not walking; and so it is in regard of all other Actions in our Power so proposed, which are the far greater Number. For considering the vast Number of voluntary Actions that succeed one another every Moment that we are awake, in the Course of our Lives, there are but few of them that are thought on or proposed to the *Will*, 'till the time they are to be done: And in all such Actions, as I have shewn, the Mind in respect of *willing*, has not a Power to act, or not to act, wherein consists Liberty: The Mind in that Case has not a Power to forbear *willing*; it cannot avoid some Determination concerning them, let the Consideration be as short, the Thought as quick, as it will, it either leaves the Man in the State he was before thinking, or changes it; continues the Action, or puts an end to it. Whereby it is manifest, that it orders and directs one in preference to, or with neglect of the other, and thereby either the continuation or change becomes unavoidably voluntary.

*The Will determined by something without it.*

§. 25. Since then it is plain that in most Cases a Man is not at Liberty, whether he will *Will*, or no; the next thing demanded is, *Whether a Man be at Liberty to will which if the two he pleases, Motion or Rest.* This Question carries the Absurdity of it so manifestly in it self, that one might thereby sufficiently be convinced, that Liberty concerns not the Will. For to ask, whether a Man be at Liberty to will either Motion, or Rest; Speaking, or Silence; which he pleases, is to ask, whether a Man can *will*, what he *wills*; or be pleased with what he is pleased with. A Question, which, I think, needs no Answer; and they, who can make a Question of it, must suppose one Will to determine the Acts of another, and another to determinate that; and so on *in infinitum.*

§. 26. To avoid these, and the like Absurdities, nothing can be of greater Use, than to establish in our Minds determined *Ideas* of the things under Consideration. If the *Ideas* of Liberty, and Volition, were well fixed in our Understandings, and carried along with us in our Minds, as they ought, through all the Questions

Questions that are raised about them, I suppose, a great part of the Difficulties, that perplex Men's Thoughts, and entangle their Understandings, would be much easier resolved; and we should perceive where the confused Signification of Terms, or where the Nature of the thing caused the Obscurity.

*Freedom.*

§. 27. *First* then, it is carefully to be remembred, That *Freedom consists in the Dependence of the Existence, or not Existence of any Action, upon our Volition of it, and not in the Dependence of any Action, or its contrary, on our preference.* A Man standing on a Cliff, is at Liberty to leap twenty Yards downwards into the Sea, not because he has a Power to do the contrary Action, which is to leap twenty Yards upwards, for that he cannot do: But he is therefore free, because he has a Power to leap, or not to leap. But if a greater Force than his, either holds him fast, or tumbles him down, he is no longer free in that Case: Because the doing, or forbearance of that particular Action, is no longer in his Power. He that is a close Prisoner, in a Room twenty foot-square, being at the North-side of his Chamber, is at Liberty to walk twenty foot Southward, because he can walk, or not walk it: But is not, at the same time, at Liberty, to do the contrary; *i. e.* to walk twenty foot Northward.

In this then consists Freedom, (*viz.*) in our being able to act, or not to act, according as we shall chuse, or *will.*

*Volition, what.*

§. 28. *Secondly*, We must remember, that *Volition*, or *Willing*, is an Act of the Mind directing its Thought, to the Production of any Action, and thereby exerting its Power to produce it. To avoid multiplying of Words, I would crave leave here, under the Word *Action*, to comprehend the forbearance too of any Action proposed; *sitting still*, or *holding ones peace*, when *walking* or *speaking* are propos'd, though mere Forbearances, requiring as much the Determination of the *Will*, and being often as weighty in their Consequences, as the contrary Actions, may, on that Consideration, well enough pass for Actions too: But this I say, that I may not be mistaken, if for brevity's sake I speak thus.

*What determines the Will.*

§. 29. *Thirdly*, The *Will* being nothing but a Power in the Mind to direct the operative Faculties of a Man to Motion or Rest, as far as they depend on such Direction. To the Question, what is it determines the Will? The true and proper Answer is, The Mind. For that which determines the

the general Power of directing, to this or that particular Direction, is nothing but the Agent it self exercising the Power it has, that particular Way. If this Answer satisfies not, 'tis plain the Meaning of the Question, *What determines the Will?* is this, What moves the Mind, in every particular Instance, to determine its general Power of directing, to this or that particular Motion or Rest? And to this I answer, The Motive, for continuing in the same State or Action, is only the present Satisfaction in it; The Motive to change, is always some *Uneasiness*: Nothing setting us upon the change of State, or upon any new Action, but some *Uneasiness*. This is the great Motive that works on the Mind to put it upon Action, which for shortness sake we will call *determining of the Will*, which I shall more at large explain.

*Will and Desire must not be confounded.*

§. 30. But in the way to it, it will be necessary to premise, that though I have above endeavoured to express the Act of *Volition*, by *chusing*, *preferring*, and the like Terms, that signify *Desire* as well as *Volition*, for want of other Words to mark that Act of the Mind, whose proper Name is *Willing* or *Volition*; yet it being a very simple Act, whosoever desires to understand what it is, will better find it by reflecting on his own Mind, and observing what it does, when it *wills*, than by any Variety of articulate Sounds whatsoever. This Caution of being careful not to be misled by Expressions, that do not enough keep up the Difference between the *Will*, and several Acts of the Mind, that are quite distinct from it, I think the more necessary: Because I find the Will often confounded with several of the Affections, especially *Desire*; and one put for the other, and that by Men, who would not willingly be thought, not to have had very distinct Notions of Things, and not to have writ very clearly about them. This, I imagine, has been no small Occasion of Obscurity and Mistake in this Matter; and therefore is, as much as may be, to be avoided. For he, that shall turn his Thoughts inwards upon what passes in his Mind, when he *wills*, shall see, that the *Will* or Power of *Volition* is conversant about nothing, but that particular Determination of the Mind, whereby, barely by a Thought, the Mind endeavours to give Rise, Continuation, or Stop to any Action, which it takes to be in its Power. This well considered, plainly shews, that the *Will* is perfectly distinguished from *Desire*, which in the very same Action may have a quite contrary Tendency from that which our *Wills* sets us upon. A Man, whom I cannot deny, may oblige me to use

uſe Perſuaſions to another, which at the ſame time I am ſpeaking, I may wiſh may not prevail on him. In this Caſe, 'tis plain the *Will* and *Deſire* run counter. I Will the Action, that tends one way, whilſt my Deſire tends another, and that the direct contrary. A Man, who by a violent Fit of the Gout in his Limbs, finds a Dozineſs in his Head, or a want of Appetite in his Stomach removed, deſires to be eaſed too of the Pain of his Feet or Hands (for where-ever there is Pain, there is a Deſire to be rid of it) though yet, whilſt he apprehends, that the removal of the Pain may tranſlate the noxious Humour to a more vital part, his *Will* is never determin'd to any one Action, that may ſerve to remove this Pain. Whence it is evident, that *deſiring* and *willing* are two diſtinct Acts of the Mind; and conſequently that the *Will*, which is but the Power of *Volition*, is much more diſtinct from *Deſire*.

*Uneaſineſs determines the Will.*

§. 31. To return then to the Enquiry, *What is it that determines the Will in regard to our Actions?* And that upon ſecond Thought I am apt to imagine is not, as is generally ſuppoſed, the greater Good in view: But ſome (and for the moſt part the moſt preſſing) *Uneaſineſs* a Man is at preſent under. This is that which ſucceſſively determines the *Will*, and ſets us upon thoſe Actions we perform. This *Uneaſineſs* we may call, as it is, *Deſire*; which is an *Uneaſineſs* of the Mind for want of ſome abſent Good. All Pain of the Body, of what ſort ſoever, and Diſquiet of the Mind, is *Uneaſineſs*: And with this is always join'd Deſire, equal to the Pain or *Uneaſineſs* felt; and is ſcarce diſtinguiſhable from it. For *Deſire* being nothing but an *Uneaſineſs* in the want of an abſent Good, in reference to any Pain felt, Eaſe is that abſent Good; and till that Eaſe be attained, we may call it *Deſire*, no Body feeling Pain, that he wiſhes not to be eaſed of, with a Deſire equal to that Pain, and inſeparable from it. Beſides this Deſire of Eaſe from Pain, there is another of abſent poſitive Good, and here alſo the Deſire and *Uneaſineſs* is equal. As much as we deſire any abſent Good, ſo much are we in Pain for it. But here all abſent Good does not, according to the Greatneſs it has, or is acknowledg'd to have, cauſe Pain equal to that Greatneſs; as all Pain cauſes Deſire equal to it ſelf: Becauſe the Abſence of Good is not always a Pain, as the Preſence of Pain is. And therefore abſent Good may be looked on, and conſidered without *Deſire*. But ſo much as there is any where of *Deſire*, ſo much there is of *Uneaſineſs*.

§. 32.

§. 32. That *Desire* is a State of *Uneasiness*, every one who reflects on himself, will quickly find. Who is there, that has not felt in *Desire*, what the Wise Man says of Hope, (which is not much different from it) that it being *deferr'd makes the Heart sick?* and that still proportionable to the Greatness of the *Desire*, which sometimes raises the *Uneasiness* to that pitch, that it makes People cry out, *Give me Children*, give me the thing desir'd, *or I die?* Life it self, and all its enjoyments, is a Burden cannot be born under the lasting and unremoved Pressure of such an *Uneasiness*. *Desire is Uneasiness.*

§. 33. Good and Evil, present and absent, 'tis true, work upon the Mind: But that which immediately determines the *Will*, from time to time, to every voluntary Action, is the *Uneasiness* of *Desire*, fixed on some absent Good, either negative, as Indolency to one in Pain; or positive, as Enjoyment of Pleasure. That it is this *Uneasiness*, that determines the *Will* to the successive voluntary Actions, whereof the greatest part of our Lives is made up, and by which we are conducted through different Courses to different Ends, I shall endeavour to shew both from Experience, and the Reason of the thing. *The Uneasiness of Desire determines the Will.*

§. 34. When a Man is perfectly content with the State he is in, which is when he is perfectly without any *Uneasiness*, what Industry, what Action, what *Will* is there left, but to continue in it? Of this every Man's Observation will satisfie him. And thus we see our All-wise Maker, suitable to our Constitution and Frame, and knowing what it is that determines the *Will*, has put into Man the *Uneasiness* of Hunger and Thirst, and other natural Desires, that return at their Seasons, to move and determine their *Wills*, for the Preservation of themselves, and the Continuation of their Species. For I think we may conclude, that, if the bare Contemplation of these good Ends, to which we are carried by these several *Uneasinesses*, had been sufficient to determine the *Will*, and set us on work, we should have had none of these natural Pains, and perhaps in this World, little or no Pain at all. *It is better to marry than to burn*, says St. *Paul*; where we may see, what it is, that chiefly drives Men into the Enjoyments of a conjugal Life. A little burning felt pushes us more powerfully, than greater Pleasures in Prospect draw or allure. *This the Spring of Action.*

§. 35. It seems so establish'd and settled a Maxim by the general

*The greateſt poſitive Good determines not the Will, but Uneaſineſs.*

neral Conſent of all Mankind, That Good, the greater Good, determines the Will, that I do not at all wonder, that when I firſt publiſh'd my Thoughts on this Subject, I took it for granted; and I imagine, that by a great many I ſhall be thought more excuſable, for having then done ſo, than that now I have ventur'd to recede from ſo received an Opinion. But yet upon a ſtricter Enquiry, I am forced to conclude, that *Good*, the *greater Good*, though apprehended and acknowledged to be ſo, does not determine the *Will*, until our Deſire, raiſed proportionably to it, makes us *uneaſy* in the want of it. Convince a Man never ſo much, that Plenty has its Advantages over Poverty; make him ſee and own, that the handſome Conveniencies of Life are better than naſty Penury; yet as long as he is content with the latter, and finds no *Uneaſineſs* in it, he moves not; his *Will* never is determin'd to any action, that ſhall bring him out of it. Let a Man be never ſo well perſwaded of the Advantages of Virtue, that it is as neceſſary to a Man, who has any great Aims in this World, or Hopes in the next, as Food to Life: Yet till he *hungers and thirſts after Righteouſneſs*; till he feels an *Uneaſineſs* in the want of it, his *Will* will not be determin'd to any Action in Purſuit of this confeſſed greater Good; but any other *Uneaſineſſes* he feels in himſelf, ſhall take place, and carry his *Will* to other Actions. On the other ſide, let a Drunkard ſee, that his Health decays, his Eſtate waſtes; Diſcredit and Diſeaſes, and the Want of all things, even of his beloved Drink attends him in the Courſe he follows: Yet the Returns of *Uneaſineſs* to miſs his Companions, the habitual Thirſt after his Cups, at the uſual time, drives him to the Tavern, though he has in his View the Loſs of Health and Plenty, and perhaps of the Joys of another Life: The leaſt of which is no inconſiderable Good, but ſuch as he confeſſes, is far greater than the tickling of his Palate with a Glaſs of Wine, or the idle Chat of a ſoaking Club. 'Tis not for want of viewing the greater Good; for he ſees, and acknowledges it, and in the Intervals of his drinking Hours, will take Reſolutions to perſue the greater Good; but when the *Uneaſineſs* to miſs his accuſtomed Delight returns, the greater acknowledged Good loſes its hold, and the preſent *Uneaſineſs* determines the *Will* to the accuſtomed Action; which thereby gets ſtronger Footing to prevail againſt the next Occaſion, though he at the ſame time makes ſecret Promiſes to himſelf, that he will do ſo no more; this is the laſt time he will

will act against the Attainment of those greater Goods. And thus he is, from time to time, in the State of that unhappy Complainer, *Video meliora proboque, Deteriora sequor*: Which Sentence, allowed for true, and made good by constant Experience, may this, and possibly no other way, be easily made intelligible.

*Because the Removal of Uneasiness is the first Step to Happiness.*

§. 36. If we enquire into the Reason of what Experience makes so evident in Fact, and examine why 'tis *Uneasiness* alone operates on the *Will*, and determines it in its Choice, we shall find, that we being capable but of one Determination of the *Will* to one Action at once, the present *Uneasiness*, that we are under, does naturally determine the Will, in order to that Happiness which we all aim at in all our Actions: For as much as whilst we are under any *Uneasiness*, we cannot apprehend our selves happy, or in the way to it. Pain and *Uneasiness* being, by every one, concluded, and felt, to be inconsistent with Happiness; spoiling the Relish, even of those good Things which we have: A little Pain serving to marr all the Pleasure we rejoyced in. And therefore that, which of Course determines the Choice of our *Will* to the next Action, will always be the removing of Pain, as long as we have any left, as the first and necessary Step towards Happiness.

*Because Uneasiness alone is present.*

§. 37. Another Reason why 'tis *Uneasiness* alone determines the Will, may be this. Because that alone is present, and 'tis against the Nature of things, that what is absent should operate, where it is not. It may be said, that absent Good may by Contemplation be brought home to the Mind, and made present. The *Idea* of it indeed may be in the Mind, and view'd as present there; but nothing will be in the Mind as a present Good, able to counter-balance the Removal of any *Uneasiness*, which we are under, till it raises our Desire, and the *Uneasiness* of that has the Prevalency in determining the *Will*. Till then the *Idea* in the Mind of whatever Good, is there only like other *Ideas*, the Object of bare unactive Speculation; but operates not on the *Will*, nor sets us on work: The Reason whereof I shall shew by and by. How many are to be found, that have had lively Representations set before their Minds of the unspeakable Joys of Heaven, which they acknowledge both possible and probable too, who yet would be content to take up with their Happiness here? and so the prevailing *Uneasinesses* of their Desires, let loose after the Enjoyments of this Life, take

their

their Turns in the determining their *Wills*, and all that while they take not one Step, are not one jot moved, towards the good Things of another Life, considered as never so great.

*Because all who allow the Joys of Heaven possible, pursue them not.*

§. 38. Were the *Will* determin'd by the Views of Good, as it appears in Contemplation greater or less to the Understanding, which is the State of all absent Good, and that which in the received Opinion the *Will* is supposed to move to, and to be moved by, I do not see how it could ever get loose from the infinite eternal Joys of Heaven, once propos'd and consider'd as possible. For all absent Good, by which alone, barely propos'd, and coming in View, the *Will* is thought to be determin'd, and so to set us on Action, being only possible, but not infallibly certain, 'tis unavoidable, that the infinitely greater possible Good should regularly and constantly determine the *Will* in all the successive Actions it directs; and then we should keep constantly and steadily in our Course towards Heaven, without ever standing still, or directing our Actions to any other End: The eternal Condition of a future State infinitely out-weighing the Expectation of Riches, or Honour, or any other Worldly Pleasure, which we can propose to our selves, though we should grant these the more probable to be attain'd: For nothing future is yet in Possession, and so the Expectation even of these may deceive us. If it were so, that the greater Good in View determines the *Will*, so great a Good once propos'd could not but seize the *Will*, and hold it fast to the Pursuit of this infinitely greatest Good, without ever letting it go again: For the *Will* having a Power over, and directing the Thoughts, as well as other Actions, would, if it were so, hold the Contemplation of the Mind fixed to that Good.

*But any great Uneasiness is never neglected.*

This would be the State of the Mind, and regular Tendency of the *Will* in all its Determinations, were it determin'd by that which is consider'd, and in View the greater Good; but that it is not so, is visible in Experience. The infinitely greatest confessed Good being often neglected, to satisfy the successive *Uneasiness* of our Desires pursuing Trifles. But though the greatest allowed, even everlasting unspeakable Good, which has sometimes moved, and affected the Mind, does not stedfastly hold the *Will*, yet we see any very great and prevailing *Uneasiness*, having once laid hold on the *Will*, lets it not go; by which we may be convinced, what it is that determines the

the *Will*. Thus any vehement Pain of the Body; the ungovernable Passion of a Man violently in Love; or the impatient Desire of Revenge, keeps the *Will* steady and intent; and the *Will* thus determin'd, never lets the Understanding lay by the Object, but all the Thoughts of the Mind, and Powers of the Body are uninterruptedly employ'd that way, by the Determinations of the *Will*, influenced by that topping *Uneasiness*, as long as it lasts; whereby it seems to me evident, that the *Will*, or Power of setting us upon one Action in preference to all other, is determin'd in us, by *Uneasiness*: And whether this be not so, I desire every one to observe in himself.

§. 39. I have hitherto chiefly instanced in the *Uneasiness* of Desire, as that which determines the *Will*. Because that is the chief, and most sensible; and the *Will* seldom orders any Action, nor is there any voluntary Action performed, without some *Desire* accompanying it; which I think is the Reason why the *Will* and *Desire* are so often confounded. But yet we are not to look upon the *Uneasiness* which makes up, or at least accompanies most of the other Passions, as wholly excluded in the Case. *Aversion*, *Fear*, *Anger*, *Envy*, *Shame*, &c. have each their *Uneasiness* too, and thereby influence the *Will*. These Passions are scarce any of them in Life and Practice, simple and alone, wholly unmixed with others; though usually in Discourse and Contemplation, that carries the Name, which operates strongest, and appears most in the present State of the Mind. Nay, there is, I think, scarce any of the Passions to be found without *Desire* join'd with it. I am sure, where ever there is *Uneasiness*, there is *Desire*: For we constantly desire Happiness; and whatever we feel of *Uneasiness*, so much, 'tis certain, we want of Happiness; even in our own Opinion, let our State and Condition otherwise be what it will. Besides, the present Moment not being our Eternity, whatever our Enjoyment be, we look beyond the present, and Desire goes with our Foresight, and that still carries the *Will* with it. So that even in *Joy* it self, that which keeps up the Action, whereon the Enjoyment depends, is the Desire to continue it, and Fear to lose it: And whenever a greater *Uneasiness* than that takes place in the Mind, the *Will* presently is by that determin'd to some new Action, and the present Delight neglected.

*Desire accompanies all Uneasiness.*

§. 40. But we being in this World beset with sundry *Uneasinesses*, distracted with different *Desires*, the next Enquiry naturally will

*The most pressing Uneasiness naturally determines the Will.*

be, which of them has the Precedency in determining the *Will* to the next Action? and to that the Answer is, that ordinarily, which is the most pressing of those that are judged capable of being then removed. For the *Will* being the Power of directing our operative Faculties to some Action, for some End, cannot at any time be moved towards what is judg'd at that time unattainable: That would be to suppose an intelligent Being designedly to act for an End, only to lose its Labour; for so it is to act for what is judg'd not attainable; and therefore very great *Uneasinesses* move not the *Will*, when they are judg'd not capable of a Cure: They, in that Case, put us not upon Endeavours. But these set a-part, the most important and urgent *Uneasiness* we at that time feel, is that which ordinarily determines the *Will* successively, in that Train of voluntary Actions, which make up our Lives. The greatest present *Uneasiness* is the Spur to Action, that is constantly felt; and for the most part determines the *Will* in its choice of the next Action. For this we must carry along with us, that the proper and only Object of the *Will* is some Action of ours, and nothing else. For we producing nothing, by our *willing* it, but some Action in our Power, 'tis there the *Will* terminates, and reaches no farther.

*All desire Happiness.*

§. 41. If it be farther asked, what 'tis moves *Desire?* I answer, Happiness, and that alone. *Happiness* and *Misery* are the Names of two Extreams, the utmost Bounds whereof we know not; 'tis what *Eye hath not seen, Ear hath not heard, nor hath it entred into the Heart of Man to conceive.* But of some Degrees of both, we have very lively Impressions, made by several Instances of Delight, and Joy on the one side; and Torment and Sorrow on the other; which, for shortness sake, I shall comprehend under the Names of Pleasure and Pain, there being Pleasure and Pain of the Mind, as well as the Body: *With him is Fulness of Joy, and Pleasure for evermore*: Or, to speak truly, they are all of the Mind; though some have their rise in the Mind from Thought, others in the Body from certain Modifications of Motion.

*Happiness, what.*

§. 42. *Happiness* then in its full Extent is the utmost Pleasure we are capable of, and *Misery* the utmost Pain: And the lowest Degree of what can be called *Happiness*, is so much Ease from all Pain, and so much present Pleasure, as without which any one cannot be content. Now because Pleasure and Pain are produced in us, by the Operation of certain Objects, either on our Minds or our Bodies;

Bodies; and in different Degrees; therefore what has an aptneſs to produce Pleaſure in us, is that we call *Good*, and what is apt to produce Pain in us, we call *Evil*, for no other Reaſon, but for its aptneſs to produce Pleaſure and Pain in us, wherein conſiſts our *Happineſs* and *Miſery*. Farther, though what is apt to produce any Degree of Pleaſure, be in it ſelf *Good*; and what is apt to produce any Degree of Pain, be *Evil*; yet it often happens, that we do not call it ſo, when it comes in Competition with a greater of its ſort; becauſe when they come in Competition, the Degrees alſo of Pleaſure and Pain have juſtly a Preference. So that if we will rightly eſtimate what we call *Good* and *Evil*, we ſhall find it lies much in Compariſon: For the Cauſe of every leſs Degree of Pain, as well as every greater Degree of Pleaſure, has the nature of *Good*, and *vice verſâ*.

*What Good is deſired, what not?*

§. 43. Though this be that, which is called *Good* and *Evil*; and all Good be the proper Object of *Deſire* in general; yet all Good, even ſeen, and confeſſed to be ſo, does not neceſſarily move every particular Man's *Deſire*; but only that part, or ſo much of it, as is conſidered, and taken to make a neceſſary part of his Happineſs. All other Good however great in reality, or appearance, excites not a Man's *Deſires*, who looks not on it to make a part of that Happineſs, wherewith he, in his preſent Thoughts, can ſatisfie himſelf. *Happineſs*, under this View, every one conſtantly purſues, and *deſires* what makes any part of it: Other things, acknowledged to be Good, he can look upon without *Deſire*; paſs by, and be content without. There is no Body, I think, ſo ſenſleſs as to deny, that there is Pleaſure in Knowledge: And for the Pleaſure of Senſe, they have too many Followers to let it be queſtion'd, whether Men are taken with them or no. Now let one Man place his ſatisfaction in ſenſual Pleaſures, another in the delight of Knowledge: Though each of them cannot but confeſs, there is great Pleaſure in what the other purſues; yet neither of them making the other's Delight a part of his Happineſs, their *Deſires* are not moved, but each is ſatisfied without what the other enjoys, and ſo his Will is not determined to the purſuit of it. But yet as ſoon as the ſtudious Man's hunger and thirſt makes him *uneaſie*, he whoſe *Will* was never determined to any purſuit of good Chear, poinant Sauces, delicious Wine, by the pleaſant taſt he has found in them, is, by the *Uneaſineſs* of Hunger and Thirſt preſently determined to Eating and Drinking; though poſſibly with great indifferency what wholeſome Food comes in his way.

And on the other side, the Epicure buckles to Study, when shame, or the desire to recommend himself to his Mistris, shall make him *uneasie* in the want of any sort of Knowledge. Thus how much so ever Men are in earnest, and constant in pursuit of Happiness; yet they may have a clear view of Good, great and confessed Good, without being concern'd for it, or moved by it, if they think they can make up their Happiness without it. Though as to Pain, that they are always concern'd for; they can feel no *Uneasiness* without being moved. And therefore being *uneasie* in the want of whatever is judged necessary to their Happiness, as soon as any Good appears to make a part of their portion of Happiness, they begin to *desire* it.

*Why the greatest good is not always desired.*

§. 44. This, I think, any one may observe in himself, and others, that the *greater visible Good* does not always raise Men's *desires* in proportion to the greatness, it appears, and is acknowledged to have: Though every little Trouble moves us, and sets us on work to get rid of it. The Reason whereof is evident from the Nature of our *Happiness* and *Misery* it self. All present Pain, whatever it be, makes a part of our present *Misery*: But all absent Good does not at any time make a necessary part of our present *Happiness*, nor the absence of it make a part of our *Misery*. If it did, we should be constantly and infinitely miserable; there being infinite degrees of Happiness, which are not in our possession. All *Uneasiness* therefore being removed, a moderate portion of Good serves at present to content Men; and some few degrees of Pleasure in a succession of ordinary Injoyments make up a Happiness, wherein they can be satisfied. If this were not so, there could be no room for those indifferent, and visibly trifling Actions, to which our *Wills* are so often determined; and wherein we voluntarily wast so much of our Lives; which remissness could by no means consist with a constant determination of *Will* or *Desire* to the greatest apparent Good. That this is so, I think few People need go far from home to be convinced. And indeed in this life there are not many, whose Happiness reaches so far, as to afford them a constant train of moderate mean Pleasures, without any mixture of *Uneasiness*; and yet they could be content to stay here for ever: Though they cannot deny, but that it is possible there may be a State of eternal durable Joys after this Life, far surpassing all the Good is to be found here. Nay, they cannot but see, that it is more possible, than the Attainment and Continuation of that Pittance of Honour, Riches, or Pleasure,

ſure, which they purſue; and for which they neglect that eternal State: But yet in full view of this Difference, ſatisfied of the Poſſibility of a perfect, ſecure, and laſting Happineſs in a future State, and under a clear Conviction, that it is not to be had here whilſt they bound their Happineſs within ſome little Enjoyment, or Aim of this Life, and exclude the Joys of Heaven from making any neceſſary part of it, their Deſires are not moved by this greater apparent Good, nor their *Wills* determin'd to any Action, or endeavour for its Attainment.

*Why not being deſired, it moves not the Will.*

§. 45. The ordinary Neceſſities of our Lives, fill a great part of them with the *Uneaſineſs* of *Hunger*, *Thirſt*, *Heat*, *Cold*, *Wearineſs* with Labour, and *Sleepineſs* in their conſtant Returns, *&c.* To which, if beſides accidental Harms, we add the fantaſtical *Uneaſineſs*, (as Itch after *Honour*, *Power*, or *Riches*, *&c.*) which acquir'd Habits by Faſhion, Example, and Education, have ſettled in us, and a thouſand other irregular Deſires, which Cuſtom has made natural to us, we ſhall find, that a very little part of our Life is ſo vacant from theſe *Uneaſineſſes*, as to leave us free to the Attraction of remoter abſent Good. We are ſeldom at eaſe, and free enough from the Sollicitation of our natural or adopted Deſires, but a conſtant Succeſſion of *Uneaſineſſes* out of that Stock, which natural Wants, or acquired Habits have heaped up, that the *Will* in their Turns; and no ſooner is one Action diſpatch'd, which by ſuch a Determination of the *Will* we are ſet upon, but another *Uneaſineſs* is ready to ſet us on work. For the removing of the Pains we feel, and are at preſent preſſed with, being the getting out of Miſery, and conſequently the firſt thing to be done in order to Happineſs, abſent Good, though thought on, confeſſed, and appearing to be good, not making any part of this Unhappineſs in its Abſence, is joſtled out, to make way for the Removal of thoſe *Uneaſineſſes* we feel, till due, and repeated Contemplation has brought it nearer to our Mind, given ſome Reliſh of it, and raiſed in us ſome Deſire; which then beginning to make a part of our preſent *Uneaſineſs*, ſtands upon fair Terms with the reſt, to be ſatisfied, and ſo according to its Greatneſs and Preſſure, comes in its turn to determine the *Will*.

*Due Conſideration raiſes Deſire.*

§. 46. And thus by a due Conſideration, and examining any Good propoſed, it is in our Power to raiſe our Deſires in a due proportion to the value of that Good, whereby in its turn, and place, it may come to work upon the *Will*, and be purſued.

For Good, though appearing, and allowed never so great, yet till it has raised Desires in our Minds, and thereby made us *uneasie* in its Want, it reaches not our *Wills*; we are not within the Sphere of its Activity; our *Wills* being under the Determination only of those *Uneasinesses*, which are present to us, which (whilst we have any) are always soliciting, and ready at hand to give the *Will* its next Determination. The balancing, when there is any in the Mind, being only which Desire shall be next satisfied, which *Uneasiness* first removed. Whereby it comes to pass, that as long as any *Uneasiness*, any Desire remains in our Mind, there is no room for *Good*, barely as such, to come at the *Will*, or at all to determine it. Because, as has been said, the first Step in our Endeavours after Happiness being to get wholly out of the Confines of Misery, and to feel no part of it, the *Will* can be at leisure for nothing else, till every *Uneasiness* we feel be perfectly removed: Which in the Multitude of Wants and Desires, we are beset with in this imperfect State, we are not like to be ever free from in this World.

*The Power to suspend the Prosecution of any Desire, makes way for Consideration.*

§. 47. There being in us a great many *Uneasinesses* always soliciting, and ready to determine the *Will*, it is natural, as I have said, that the greatest and most pressing should determine the *Will* to the next Action; and so it does for the most part, but not always. For the Mind having in most Cases, as is evident in Experience, a Power to *suspend* the Execution and Satisfaction of any of its Desires, and so all, one after another, is at liberty to consider the Objects of them; examine them on all sides, and weigh them with others. In this lies the Liberty Man has; and from the not using of it right, comes all that Variety of Mistakes, Errors, and Faults which we run into, in the Conduct of our Lives, and our Endeavours after Happiness; whilst we precipitate the Determination of our *Wills*, and engage too soon before due *Examination*. To prevent this, we have a Power to *suspend* the Prosecution of this or that Desire, as every one daily may Experiment in himself. This seems to me the Source of all Liberty; in this seems to consist that which is (as I think improperly) call'd *Free Will*. For during this *Suspension* of any Desire, before the *Will* be determined to Action, and the Action (which follows that Determination) done, we have Opportunity to examine, view, and judge, of the Good or Evil of what we are going to do; and when, upon due *Examination*, we have judg'd, we have done our Duty, all that we can, or

ought

ought to do, in pursuit of our Happiness; and 'tis not a Fault, but a Perfection of our Nature to desire, will, and act according to the last Result of a fair *Examination*.

*To be determined by our own Judgment, is no Restraint to Liberty.*

§. 48. This is so far from being a Restraint or Diminution of *Freedom*, that it is the very Improvement and Benefit of it; 'tis not an Abridgment, 'tis the End and Use of our *Liberty*; and the farther we are removed from such a Determination, the nearer we are to Misery and Slavery. A perfect Indifferency in the Mind, not determinable by its last Judgment of the Good or Evil, that is thought to attend its Choice, would be so far from being an Advantage and Excellency of any intellectual Nature, that it would be as great an Imperfection, as the Want of Indifferency to act, or not to act, till determined by the *Will*, would be an Imperfection on the other side. A Man is at liberty to lift up his Hand to his Head, or let it rest quiet: He is perfectly indifferent in either; and it would be an Imperfection in him, if he wanted that Power, if he were deprived of that Indifferency. But it would be as great an Imperfection, if he had the same Indifferency, whither he would prefer the lifting up his Hand, or its remaining in rest, when it would save his Head or Eyes from a Blow he sees coming: *'Tis* as much *a Perfection that Desire, or the Power of Preferring, should be determined by Good*, as that the Power of Acting should be determined by the *Will*, and the certainer such Determination is, the greater is the Perfection. Nay, were we determined by any thing but the last Result of our own Minds, judging of the Good or Evil of any Action, we were not free. The very End of our Freedom being, that we might attain the Good we chuse. And therefore every Man is but under a Necessity by his Constitution, as an intelligent Being, to be determined in *willing* by his own Thought and Judgment, what is best for him to do: Else he would be under the Determination of some other than himself, which is want of Liberty. And to deny, that a Man's *Will*, in every Determination, follows his own Judgment, is to say, that a Man *wills* and acts for an End that he would not have at the time that he *wills* and acts for it. For if he prefers it in his present Thoughts before any other, 'tis plain he then thinks better of it, and would have it before any other, unless he can have, and not have it; *will* and not *will* it at the same time; a Contradiction too manifest to be admitted!

§. 49. If we look upon those *superior Beings* above us, who

*The freest Agents are so determined.*

enjoy perfect Happiness, we shall have Reason to judge, that they are more steadily *determined in their Choice of Good*, than we; and yet we have no Reason to think they are less happy, or less free, than we are. And if it were fit for such poor finite Creatures as we are, to pronounce what infinite Wisdom and Goodness could do, I think, we might say, that God himself cannot chuse what is not good; the Freedom of the Almighty hinders not his being determined by what is best.

*A constant Determination to a pursuit of Happiness, no Abridgment of Liberty.*

§. 50. But to give a right View of this mistaken part of Liberty, let me ask, Would any one be a Changeling, because he is less determined by wise Considerations, than a wise Man? Is it worth the Name of *Freedom* to be at liberty to play the Fool, and draw Shame and Misery upon a Man's self? If to break loose from the Conduct of Reason, and to want that Restraint of Examination and Judgment, which keeps us from chusing or doing the worse, be *Liberty*, true Liberty, and Mad-men and Fools are the only Free-men: But yet, I think, no Body would chuse to be mad for the sake of such *Liberty*, but he that is mad already. The constant Desire of Happiness, and the Constraint it puts upon us to act for it, no Body, I think, accounts an Abridgment of *Liberty*, or at least an Abridgment of *Liberty* to be complain'd of. God Almighty himself is under the Necessity of being happy; and the more any intelligent Being is so, the nearer is its Approach to infinite Perfection and Happiness. That in this State of Ignorance we short-sighted Creatures might not mistake true Felicity, we are endowed with a Power to suspend any particular Desire, and keep it from determining the *Will*, and engaging us in Action. This is *standing still*, where we are not sufficiently assured of the way: Examination, is *consulting a Guide*. The Determination of the *Will*, upon Enquiry, is *following the Direction of that Guide*: And he that has a Power to Act, or not to Act according as such Determination directs, is a *free Agent*; such Determination abridges not that Power wherein Liberty consists. He that has his Chains knocked off, and the Prison-doors set open to him, is perfectly at *Liberty*, because he may either go or stay, as he best likes; though is Preference be determined to stay, by the Darkness of the Night, or Illness of the Weather, or Want of other Lodging. He ceases not to be free; though the Desire of some Covenience to be had there, absolutely determines his Preference, and makes him stay in his Prison.

§. 51.

§. 51. As therefore the higheſt Perfection of intellectual Nature, lies in a careful and conſtant Purſuit of true and ſolid Happineſs; ſo the Care of our ſelves, that we miſtake not imaginary for real Happineſs, is the neceſſary Foundation of our *Liberty*. The ſtronger Ties we have to an unalterable Purſuit of Happineſs in general, which is our greateſt Good, and which, as ſuch, our Deſires always follow, the more are we free from any neceſſary Determination of our *Will* to any particular Action, and from a neceſſary Compliance with our Deſire, ſet upon any particular, and then appearing preferable Good, till we have duly examin'd, whether it has a Tendency to, or be inconſtant with our real Happineſs: And therefore till we are as much inform'd upon this Enquiry, as the Weight of the Matter, and the Nature of the Caſe demands, we are by the Neceſſity of prefering and purſuing true Happineſs as our greateſt Good, obliged to ſuſpend the Satisfaction of our Deſire in particular Caſes.

*The Neceſſity of purſuing true Happineſs, the Foundation of Liberty.*

§. 52. This is the Hinge on which turns the *Liberty* of intellectual Beings in their conſtant Endeavours after, and a ſteady Proſecution of true Felicity, that they can *ſuſpend* this Proſecution in particular Caſes, till they have looked before them, and informed themſelves, whether that particular thing which is then propoſed or deſired, lie in the way to their main End, and make a real Part of that which is their greateſt Good; for the Inclination and Tendency of their Nature to Happineſs, is an Obligation and Motive to them, to take care not to miſtake, or miſs it; and ſo neceſſarily puts them upon Caution, Deliberation, and Warineſs, in the Direction of their particular Actions, which are the Means to obtain it. Whatever Neceſſity determines to the purſuit of real Bliſs, the ſame Neceſſity, with the ſame Force eſtabliſhes *Suſpence*, *Deliberation*, and Scrutiny of each ſucceſſive Deſire, whether the Satisfaction of it does not interfere with our true Happineſs, and miſlead us from it. This, as ſeems to me, is the great Privilege of finite intellectual Beings; and I deſire it may be well conſider'd, whether the great Inlet, and Exerciſe of all the *Liberty* Men have, are capable of, or can be uſeful to them, and that whereon depends the Turn of their Actions, does not lie in this, that they can *ſuſpend* their Deſires, and ſtop them from determining their *Wills* to any Action, till they have duly and fairly *examin'd* the Good and Evil of it, as far forth as the Weight of the thing requires.

*The Reaſon of it.*

quires. This we are able to do; and when we have done it, we have done our Duty, and all that is in our Power; and indeed all that needs. For, since the *Will* supposes Knowledge to guide its Choice, all that we can do, is to hold our *Wills* undetermined, till we have *examin'd* the Good and Evil of what we desire. What follows after that, follows in a Chain of Consequences linked one to another, all depending on the last Determination of the Judgment, which whether it shall be upon an hasty and precipitate View, or upon a due and mature *Examination*, is in our Power; Experience shewing us, that in most Cases we are able to suspend the present Satisfaction of any Desire.

*Government of our Passions, the right Improvement of Liberty.*

§. 53. But if any extreme Disturbance (as sometimes it happens) possesses our whole Mind, as when the Pain of the Rack, an impetuous *Uneasiness*, as of Love, Anger, or any other violent Passion, running away with us, allows us not the Liberty of Thought, and we are not Masters enough of our own Minds to consider throughly, and examine fairly; God, who knows our Frailty, pities our Weakness, and requires of us no more than we are able to do, and sees what was, and what was not in our Power; will judge as a kind and merciful Father. But the Forbearance of a too hasty Compliance with our Desires, the Moderation and Restraint of our Passions, so that our Understandings may be *free* to examine, and Reason unbiassed give its Judgment, being that whereon a right Direction of our Conduct to true Happiness depends: 'Tis in this we should employ our chief Care and Endeavours. In this we should take Pains to suit the Relish of our Minds to the true intrinsick Good or Ill that is in things, and not permit an allow'd or supposed possible great and weighty Good to slip out of our Thoughts without leaving any Relish, any Desire of it self there, till, by a due Consideration of its true Worth, we have formed Appetites in our Minds suitable to it, and made our selves uneasie in the want of it, or in the fear of losing it. And how much this is in every one's Power, every one, by making Resolutions to himself, such as he may keep, is easie for every one to try. Nor let any one say, he cannot govern his Passions, nor hinder them from breaking out, and carrying him into Action; for what he can do before a Prince, or a great Man, he can do alone, or in the Presence of God, if he will.

§. 54. From what has been said, it is easie to give account, how

how it comes to pass, that though all Men desire Happiness, yet their *Wills carry them so contrarily*, and consequently some of them to what is Evil. And to this I say, that the various and contrary Choices that Men make in the World, do not argue, that they do not all pursue Good; but that the same thing is not good to every Man alike. This Variety of Pursuits shews, that every one does not place his Happiness in the same thing, or chuse the same way to it. Were all the Concerns of Man terminated in this Life, why one followed Study and Knowledge, and another Hawking and Hunting; why one chose Luxury and Debauchery, and another Sobriety and Riches, would not be, because every one of these did not aim at his own Happiness; but because their *Happiness* was placed in different things. And therefore 'twas a right Answer of the Physician to his Patient that had sore Eyes: If you have more Pleasure in the Taste of Wine, than in the Use of your Sight, Wine is good for you; but if the Pleasure of Seeing be greater to you than that of Drinking, Wine is naught.

*How Men come to pursue different Courses.*

§. 55. The Mind has a different Relish, as well as the Palate; and you will as fruitlesly endeavour to delight all Men with Riches or Glory, (which yet some Men place their Happiness in,) as you would to satisfy all Mens Hunger with Cheese or Lobsters; which though very agreeable and delicious Fair to some, are to others extremely nauseous and offensive: And many People would with Reason prefer the Griping of an hungry Belly to those Dishes, which are a Feast to others. Hence it was, I think, that the Philosophers of Old did in vain enquire, whether *Summum bonum* consisted in Riches, or bodily Delights, or Virtue or Contemplation? And they might have as reasonably disputed, whether the best Relish were to be found in Apples, Plumbs, or Nuts; and have divided themselves into Sects upon it. For as pleasant Tastes depend not on the things themselves, but their Agreeableness to this or that particular Palate, wherein there is great Variety; so the greatest Happiness consists in the having those things which produce the greatest Pleasure; and in the Absence of those which cause any Disturbance, any Pain. Now, these to different Men, are very different things. If therefore Men in this Life only have Hope; if in this Life they can only enjoy, 'tis not strange, nor unreasonable, that they should seek their Happiness by avoiding all things that disease them here, and by pursuing all that delight them; wherein it will be no wonder to find Variety and Difference.

Difference. For if there be no Prospect beyond the Grave, the Inference is certainly right, *Let us eat and drink*, let us enjoy what we delight in, *for to Morrow we shall die.* This, I think, may serve to shew us the Reason, why, though all Mens Desires tend to Happiness, yet they are not moved by the same Object. Men may chuse different things, and yet all chuse right, supposing them only like a Company of poor Insects, whereof some are Bees, delighted with Flowers and their Sweetness; others Beetles, delighted with other kind of Viands; which having enjoyed for a Season, they should cease to be, and exist no more for ever.

*How Men come to chuse it.*

§. 56. These things duly weigh'd, will give us, as I think, a clear View into the State of Human Liberty. Liberty 'tis plain consists in a Power to do, or not to do; to do, or forbear doing as we *will*. This cannot be deny'd. But this seeming to comprehend only the Actions of a Man consecutive to Volition, it is farther enquired, whether he be at Liberty to *will* or no? and to this it has been answered, that in most Cases a Man is not at Liberty to forbear the Act of Volition; he must exert an Act of his *Will*, whereby the Action proposed, is made to exist, or not to exist. But yet there is a Case wherein a Man is at Liberty in respect of *Willing*, and that is the chusing of a remote Good as an End to be pursued. Here a Man may suspend the Act of his Choice from being determined for or against the thing proposed, 'till he has examined, whether it be really of a Nature in its self and Consequences to make him happy or no. For when he has once chosen it, and thereby it is become a part of his Happiness, it raises Desire, and that proportionably gives him Uneasiness, which determines his *Will*, and sets him at work in Pursuit of his Choice on all Occasions that offer. And here we may see how it comes to pass, that a Man may justly incur Punishment, though it be certain that in all the particular Actions that he *wills*, he does, and necessarily does will that which he then judges to be good. For though his *Will* be always determined by that which is judg'd good by his Understanding, yet it excuses him not: Because, by a too hasty Choice of his own making, he has imposed on himself wrong Measures of Good and Evil; which however false and fallacious, have the same Influence on all his future Conduct, as if they were true and right. He has vitiated his own Palate, and must be answerable to himself for the Sickness and Death that follows from it. The eternal Law and Nature

of

of things must not be alter'd to comply with his ill-order'd Choice. If the Neglect or Abuse of the Liberty he had to examine what would really and truly make for his Happiness, misleads him, the Miscarriages that follow on it, must be imputed to his own Election. He had a Power to suspend his Determination: It was given him, that he might examine, and take care of his own Happiness, and look that he were not deceived. And he could never judge, that it was better to be deceived, than not in a Matter of so great and near Concernment.

What has been said, may also discover to us the Reason why Men in this World prefer different things, and pursue Happiness by contrary Courses. But yet since Men are always constant, and in earnest, in Matter of Happiness and Misery, the Question still remains, *How Men come often to prefer the worse to the better*; and to chuse that, which by their own Confession, has made them miserable.

§. 57. To account for the various and contrary ways Men take, though all aim at being happy, we must consider, whence the various *Uneasinesses*, that determine the Will in the Preference of each voluntary Action, have their Rise.

*From bodily Pain.*

1. Some of them come from Causes not in our Power, such as are often the Pains of the Body from Want, Disease, or outward Injuries, as the Rack, *&c.* which when present, and violent, operate for the most part forcibly on the *Will*, and turn the Courses of Mens Lives from Virtue, Piety, and Religion, and what, before they judged, to lead to Happiness; every one not endeavouring, or through Disuse, not being able by the Contemplation of remote and future Good, to raise in himself Desires of them strong enough to counter-balance the Uneasiness he feels in those bodily Torments; and to keep his *Will* steady in the Choice of those Actions which lead to future Happiness. A neighbour Country has been of late a Tragical Theatre, from which we might fetch Instances, if there needed any, and the World did not in all Countries and Ages furnish Examples enough to confirm that received Observation, *Necessitas cogit ad Turpia*; and therefore there is great Reason for us to pray, *Lead us not into Temptation.*

*From wrong Desires arising from wrong Judgment.*

2. Other *Uneasinesses* arise from our Desires of absent Good; which Desires always bear Proportion to, and depend on the Judgment we make, and the Relish we have of any absent

Good;

Good; in both which we are apt to be variously misled, and that by our own Fault.

*Our Judgment of present Good or Evil always right.*

§. 58. In the first place, I shall consider the wrong Judgments Men make of future Good and Evil, whereby their Desires are misled. For as to present Happiness and Misery, when that alone comes in Consideration, and the Consequences are quite removed, *a Man never chuses amiss*; he knows what best pleases him, and that he actually prefers. Things in their present Enjoyment, are what they seem; the apparent and real Good are, in this Case, always the same. For the Pain or Pleasure being just so great, and no greater, than it is felt, the present Good or Evil, is really so much as it appears. And therefore were every Action of ours concluded within it self, and drew no Consequences after it, we should undoubtedly never err in our Choice of Good; we should always infallibly prefer the best. Were the Pains of honest Industry, and of starving with Hunger and Cold, set together before us, no Body would be in doubt which to chuse: Were the Satisfaction of a Lust, and the Joys of Heaven offered at once to any one's present Possession, he would not balance, or err in the Determination of his Choice.

§. 59. But since our voluntary Actions carry not all the Happiness and Misery, that depend on them, along with them in their present Performance, but are the precedent Causes of Good and Evil, which they draw after them, and bring upon us, when they themselves are passed, and cease to be; our Desires look beyond our present Enjoyments, and carry the Mind out to absent *Good*, according to the Necessity which we think there is of it, to the making or increase of our Happiness. 'Tis our Opinion of such a Necessity that gives it its Attraction: Without that, we are not moved by absent *Good*. For in this narrow Scantling of Capacity, which we are accustomed to, and sensible of here, wherein we enjoy but one Pleasure at once, which, when all Uneasiness is away, is, whilst it lasts, sufficient to make us think our selves happy; 'tis not all remote, and even apparent Good, that affects us. Because the Indolency and Enjoyment we have, sufficing for our present Happiness, we desire not to venture the Change: Since we judge that we are happy already, being content, and that is enough. For who is content, is happy. But as soon as any new Uneasiness comes in, this Happiness is disturb'd, and we are set afresh on work in the pursuit of Happiness.

§. 60.

§. 60. Their Aptneſs therefore to conclude, that they can be happy without it, is one great Occaſion that Men often are not raiſed to the Deſire of the greateſt abſent *Good*. For whilſt ſuch Thoughts poſſeſs them, the Joys of a future State move them not; they have little Concern or Uneaſineſs about them; and the *Will*, free from the Determination of ſuch Deſires, is left to the purſuit of nearer Satisfactions, and to the removal of thoſe Uneaſineſſes which it then feels in its want of, and longings after them. Change but a Man's View of theſe things; let him ſee, that Virtue and Religion are neceſſary to his Happineſs; let him look into the future State of Bliſs or Miſery, and ſee there God, the righteous Judge, ready to *render to every Man according to his Deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, ſeek for Glory, and Honour, and Immortality, eternal Life; but unto every Soul that doth Evil, Indignation and Wrath, Tribulation and Anguiſh*: To him, I ſay, who hath a Proſpect of the different State of perfect Happineſs or Miſery, that attends all Men after this Life, depending on their Behaviour here, the Meaſures of Good and Evil, that govern his Choice, are mightily changed. For ſince nothing of Pleaſure and Pain in this Life, can bear any Proportion to endleſs Happineſs, or exquiſite Miſery of an Immortal Soul hereafter, Actions in his Power will have their Preference, not according to the tranſient Pleaſure or Pain that accompanies, or follows them here; but as they ſerve to ſecure that perfect durable Happineſs hereafter.

*From a wrong Judgment of what makes a neceſſary part of their Happineſs.*

§. 61. But to account more particularly for the Miſery that Men often bring on themſelves, notwithſtanding that they do all in earneſt purſue Happineſs, we muſt conſider, how *Things* come to be *repreſented* to our Deſires, *under deceitful Appearances*: And that is *by the Judgment* pronouncing wrongly concerning them. To ſee how far this reaches, and what are the Cauſes of wrong Judgment, we muſt remember, that things are judged good or bad in a double Senſe.

*A more particular Account of wrong Judgments.*

*Firſt, That which is properly good or bad, is nothing but barely Pleaſure or Pain.*

*Secondly*, But becauſe not only preſent Pleaſure and Pain, but that alſo which is apt by its Efficacy or Conſequences, to bring it upon us at a diſtance is a proper Object of our Deſires, and apt to move a Creature that has foreſight; therefore *things* alſo *that draw after them Pleaſure and Pain, are conſidered as Good and Evil.*

§. 62.

§. 62. The *wrong Judgment* that *misleads us*, and makes the Will often fasten on the worse side, lies in misreporting upon the various Comparisons of these. The *wrong Judgment* I am here speaking of, is not what one Man may think of the Determination of another; but what every Man himself must confess to be wrong. For since I lay it for a certain Ground, that every intelligent Being really seeks Happiness, which consists in the Enjoyment of Pleasure, without any considerable Mixture of Uneasiness; 'tis impossible any one should willingly put into his own Draught any bitter Ingredient, or leave out any thing in his Power, that would tend to his Satisfaction, and the compleating of his Happiness, but only by *wrong Judgment*. I shall not here speak of that Mistake which is the Consequence of invincible Error, which scarce deserves the Name of *wrong Judgment*; but of that *wrong Judgment* which every Man himself must confess to be so.

*In comparing present and future.*

§. 63. I. Therefore, as to present Pleasure and Pain, the Mind, as has been said, never mistakes that which is really Good or Evil; that which is the greater Pleasure, or the greater Pain, is really just as it appears. But though present Pleasure and Pain shew their Difference and Degrees so plainly, as not to leave room for mistake; yet *when we compare present Pleasure or Pain with future*, (which is usually the Case in the most important Determinations of the Will) *we often make wrong Judgments* of them, taking our Measures of them in different Positions of Distance. Objects, near our View, are apt to be thought greater, than those of a larger size, that are more remote: And so it is with Pleasures and Pains, the present is apt to carry it, and those at a distance have the Disadvantage in the Comparison. Thus most Men, like spent-thrift Heirs, are apt to judge a little in Hand better than a great deal to come; and so for small Matters in Possession, part with great ones in Reversion. But that this is a *wrong Judgment*, every one must allow, let his Pleasure consist in whatever it will: Since that which is future, will certainly come to be present; and then, having the same Advantage of Nearness, will shew it self in its full Dimensions, and discover his wilful Mistake, who judged of it by unequal Measures. Were the Pleasure of Drinking accompanied, the very moment a Man takes off his Glass, with that sick Stomack and aking Head, which, in some Men, are sure to follow not many Hours after, I think no Body, whatever Pleasure he had in his Cups, would, on these Conditions, ever let Wine touch his Lips; which

which yet he daily ſwallows, and the evil ſide comes to be choſen only by the Fallacy of a little Difference in time. But if Pleaſure or Pain can be ſo leſſened only by a few Hours removal, how much more will it be ſo, by a farther Diſtance, to a Man that will not by a right Judgment do what time will, *i. e.* bring it home upon himſelf, and conſider it as preſent, and there take its true Dimenſions? This is the way we uſually impoſe on our ſelves, in reſpect of bare Pleaſure and Pain, or the true Degrees of Happineſs or Mercy: The future loſſes its juſt Proportion, and what is preſent, obtains the Preference as the greater. I mention not here the *wrong Judgment*, whereby the abſent are not only leſſened, but reduced to perfect nothing; when Men enjoy what they can in preſent, and make ſure of that, concluding amiſs, that no Evil will thence follow. For that lies not in comparing the Greatneſs of future Good and Evil, which is that we are here ſpeaking of; but in another ſort of *wrong Judgment*, which is concerning Good or Evil, as it is conſidered to be the Cauſe and Procurement of Pleaſure or Pain, that will follow from it.

§. 64. *The Cauſe of our judging amiſs*, when we compare our preſent Pleaſure or Pain with future, ſeems to me to be *the weak and narrow Conſtitution of our Minds*. We cannot well enjoy two Pleaſures at once, much leſs any Pleaſure almoſt, whilſt Pain poſſeſſes us. The preſent Pleaſure, if it be not very languid, and almoſt none at all, fills our narrow Souls, and ſo takes up the whole Mind, that it ſcarce leaves any Thought of things abſent: Or if among our Pleaſures, there are ſome which are not ſtrong enough to exclude the Conſideration of things at a diſtance; yet we have ſo great an Abhorrence of Pain, that a little of it extinguiſhes all our Pleaſures: A little Bitter mingled in our Cup, leaves no Reliſh of the Sweet. Hence it comes, that, at any Rate, we deſire to be rid of the preſent Evil, which we are apt to think nothing abſent can equal; becauſe under the preſent Pain, we find not our ſelves capable of any the leaſt Degree of Happineſs. Mens daily Complaints, are a loud Proof of this: The Pain that any one actually feels, is ſtill of all other the worſt; and 'tis with Anguiſh they cry out, *Any rather than this*; *nothing can be ſo intolerable as what I now ſuffer.* And therefore our whole Endeavours and Thoughts are intent to get rid of the preſent Evil, before all things, as the firſt neceſſary Condition to our Happineſs, let what will follow. Nothing, as we paſſionately think, can exceed, or almoſt equal, the Uneaſineſs that ſits ſo heavy upon us.

*Cauſes of this.*

And becauſe the Abſtinence from a preſent Pleaſure, that offers it ſelf, is a Pain, nay, oftentimes a very great one, the Deſire being inflamed by a near and tempting Object; 'tis no wonder that that operates after the ſame manner Pain does, and leſſens in our Thoughts what is future; and ſo forces us, as it were, blindfold into its Embraces.

§. 65. Add to this, that abſent Good, or which is the ſame thing, future Pleaſure, eſpecially if of a ſort which we are unacquainted with, ſeldom is able to counter-balance any Uneaſineſs, either of Pain or Deſire, which is preſent. For its Greatneſs being no more than what ſhall be really taſted when enjoyed, Men are apt enough to leſſen that, to make it give place to any preſent Deſire; and conclude with themſelves, that when it comes to Trial, it may poſſible not anſwer the Report, or Opinion, that generally paſſes of it, they having often found, that not only what others have magnified, but even what they themſelves have enjoyed with great Pleaſure and Delight at one time, has proved inſipid or nauſeous at another; and therefore they ſee nothing in it, for which they ſhould forego a preſent Enjoyment. But that this is a *falſe* way of *judging*, when apply'd to the Happineſs of another Life, they muſt confeſs, unleſs, they will ſay, God cannot make thoſe happy he deſigns to be ſo. For that being intended for a State of Happineſs, it muſt certainly be agreeable to every one's Wiſh and Deſire: Could we ſuppoſe their Reliſhes as different there, as they are here, yet the Manna in Heaven will ſuit every one's Palate. Thus much of the *wrong Judgment* we make of preſent and future Pleaſure and Pain, when they are compared together, and ſo the abſent conſidered as future.

*In conſidering Conſequences of Actions.*

§. 66. II. *As to things good or bad in their Conſequences*, and by the Aptneſs is in them to procure us Good or Evil in the future, *we judge amiſs ſeveral ways.*

1. When we *judge* that ſo much Evil does not really depend on them, as in Truth there does.

2. When we *judge*, that though the Conſequence be of that Moment, yet it is not of that Certainty, but that it may otherwiſe fall out; or elſe by ſome Means be avoided, as by Induſtry, Addreſs, Change, Repentance, *&c.* That theſe are *wrong* Ways of *judging*, were eaſy to ſhew, in every Particular, if I would examine them at large ſingly: But I ſhall only mention this in general, *viz.* That it is a very wrong, and irrational Way of proceeding, to venture a greater Good, for a leſs, upon uncertain

uncertain Guesses, and before a due Examination be made, proportionable to the Weightiness of the Matter, and the Concernment it is to us not to mistake. This, I think, every one must confess, especially if he considers the usual *Causes* of this *wrong Judgment*, whereof these following are some.

§. 67. I. *Ignorance*: He that judges without informing himself to the utmost that he is capable, cannot acquit himself of *judging amiss*. *Causes of this.*

II. *Inadvertency*: When a Man overlooks even that which he does know. This is in an affected and present Ignorance, which misleads our Judgments as much as the other. Judging is, as it were, balancing an Account, and determining on which side the odds lies. If therefore either side be hudled up in haste, and several of the Sums, that should have gone into the Reckoning, be overlook'd, and left out, this Precipitancy causes as *wrong a Judgment*, as if it were a perfect Ignorance. That which most commonly causes this, is the Prevalency of some present Pleasure or Pain, heightned by our feeble passionate Nature, most strongly wrought on by what is present. To check this Precipitancy, our Understanding and Reason was given us, if we will make a right Use of it, to search, and see, and then judge thereupon. Without Liberty, the Understanding would be to no purpose: And without Understanding, Liberty (if it could be) would signify nothing. If a Man sees what would do him good or harm, what would make him happy or miserable, without being able to move himself one Step towards or from it, what is he the better for seeing? And he that is at Liberty to ramble in perfect Darkness, what is his Liberty better, than if he were driven up and down as a Bubble by the Force of the Wind? The being acted by a blind Impulse from without, or from within, is little odds. The first therefore, and great Use of Liberty, is to hinder blind Precipitancy; the principal Exercise of Freedom, is to stand still, open the Eyes, look about, and take a View of the Consequence of what we are going to do, as much as the Weight of the Matter requires. How much Sloth and Negligence, Heat and Passion, the Prevalency of Fashion, or acquired Indispositions, do severally contribute on occasion, to these *wrong Judgments*, I shall not here farther enquire. I shall only add one other false Judgment, which I think necessary to mention, because perhaps it is little taken notice of, though of great Influence.

*Wrong Judgment of what is neceſſary to our Happineſs*

§. 68. All Men deſire Happineſs, that's paſt doubt: But, as has been already obſerved, when they are rid of Pain, they are apt to take up with any Pleaſure at hand, or that Cuſtom has endear'd to them, to reſt ſatisfied in that; and ſo being happy, 'till ſome new Deſire, by making them uneaſy, diſturbs that Happineſs, and ſhews them, that they are not ſo, they look no farther; nor is the Will determined to any Action in Purſuit of any other known or apparent Good. For ſince we find, that we cannot enjoy all ſorts of Good, but one excludes another; we do not fix our Deſires on every apparent greater Good, unleſs it be judged to be neceſſary to our Happineſs: If we think we can be happy without it, it moves us not. This is another Occaſion to Men of *judging wrong*, when they take not that to be neceſſary to their Happineſs, which really is ſo. This Miſtake miſleads us both in the Choice of the Good we aim at, and very often in the Means to it, when it is a remote Good. But, which Way ever it be, either by placing it where really it is not, or by neglecting the Means, as not neceſſary to it, when a Man miſſes his great End Happineſs, he will acknowledge he judg'd not right. That which contributes to this Miſtake, is the real or ſuppos'd Unpleaſantneſs of the Actions, which are the Way to this End, it ſeeming ſo prepoſterous a thing to Men, to make themſelves unhappy in order to Happineſs, that they do not eaſily bring themſelves to it.

*We can change the Agreeableneſs or Diſagreeableneſs in things.*

§. 69. The laſt Enquiry therefore concerning this Matter, is, Whether it be in a Man's Power to change the Pleaſantneſs, and Unpleaſantneſs, that accompanies any ſort of Action? and to that, it is plain in many Caſes he can. Men may and ſhould correct their Palates, and give a Reliſh to what either has, or they ſuppoſe has none. The Reliſh of the Mind, is as various as that of the Body, and like that too may be alter'd; and 'tis a Miſtake to think, that Men cannot change the Diſpleaſingneſs, or Indifferency, that is in Actions into Pleaſure and Deſire, if they will do but what is in their Power. A due Conſideration will do it in ſome Caſes; and Practice, Application, and Cuſtom in moſt. Bread or Tobacco may be neglected, where they are ſhewn to be uſeful to Health, becauſe of an Indifferency or Diſreliſh to them; Reaſon and Conſideration at firſt recommends, and begins their Trial, and Uſe finds, or Cuſtom makes them pleaſant. That

this

this is so in Vertue too, is very certain. Actions are pleasing or displeasing, either in themselves, or consider'd as a Means to a greater and more desirable End. The eating of a well-season'd Dish, suited to a Man's Palate, may move the Mind by the Delight it self, that accompanies the eating, without Reference to any other End: To which the Consideration of the Pleasure there is in Health and Strength, (to which that Meat is subservient) may add a new Gusto, able to make us swallow an ill reliſh'd Potion. In the latter of these, any Action is render'd more or less pleasing, only by the Contemplation of the End, and the being more or less perswaded of its Tendency to it, or necessary Connexion with it: But the Pleasure of the Action it self is best acquir'd, or increased, by Use and Practice. Trials often reconcile us to that, which at a distance we looked on with Aversion; and by Repetitions wears us into a liking of what possibly, in the first Essay, displeased us. Habits have powerful Charms, and put so strong Attractions of Easiness and Pleasure into what we accustom our selves to, that we cannot forbear to do, or at least be easy in the Omission of Actions; which habitual Practice has suited, and thereby recommends to us. Though this be very visible, and every one's Experience shews him he can do; yet it is a part, in the Conduct of Men towards their Happiness, neglected to a Degree, that it will be possibly entertain'd as a Paradox, if it be said, that Men can make Things or Actions more or less pleasing to themselves; and thereby remedy that, to which one may justly impute a great deal of their wandering. Fashion and the common Opinion having settled wrong Notions, and Education and Custom ill Habits, the just Values of things are misplaced, and the Palates of Men corrupted. Pains should be taken to rectify these; and contrary Habits change our Pleasures, and give a Reliſh to that, which is necessary, or conducive to our Happiness. This every one must confess he can do, and when Happiness is lost, and Misery overtakes him, he will confess, he did amiss in neglecting it, and condemn himself for it: And I ask every one, whether he has not often done so?

§. 70. I shall not enlarge any farther on the *wrong Judgments*, and Neglect of what is in their Power, whereby Men mislead themselves. This would make a Volume, and is not my Business. But whatever false Notions, or shameful Neglect of what is in their Power, may put Men out of their Way to Happiness, and distract them, as we see, into

*Preference of Vice to Vertue, a manifest wrong Judgment.*

into so different Courses of Life, this yet is certain, that Morality, established upon its true Foundations, cannot but determine the Choice in any one, that will but consider: And he that will not be so far a rational Creature, as to reflect seriously upon infinite Happiness and Misery, must needs condemn himself, as not making that Use of his Understanding he should. The Rewards and Punishments of another Life, which the Almighty has establish'd, as the Enforcements of his Law, are of Weight enough to determine the Choice, against whatever Pleasure or Pain this Life can shew, when the eternal State is considered but in its bare Possibility, which no Body can make any doubt of. He that will allow exquisite and endless Happiness to be but the possible Consequence of a good Life here, and the contrary State, the possible Reward of a bad one, must own himself to judge very much amiss, if he does not conclude, That a vertuous Life, with the certain Expectation of everlasting Bliss, which may come, is to be preferred to a vicious one, with the Fear of that dreadful State of Misery, which 'tis very possible may overtake the Guilty; or at best the terrible uncertain Hope of Annihilation. This is evidently so, though the vertuous Life here had nothing but Pain, and the vicious continual Pleasure: Which yet is, for the most part, quite otherwise, and wicked Men have not much the odds to brag of, even in their present Possession; nay, all things rightly considered, have, I think, even the worst part here. But when infinite Happiness is put in one Scale, against infinite Misery in the other; if the worst that comes to the pious Man, if he mistakes, be the best that the wicked can attain to, if he be in the right, who can without Madness run the Venture? Who in his Wits would chuse to come within a Possibility of infinite Misery, which if he miss, there is yet nothing to be got by that Hazard? Whereas on the other side, the sober Man ventures nothing against infinite Happiness to be got, if his Expectation comes to pass. If the good Man be in the right, he is eternally happy; if he mistakes, he is not miserable, he feels nothing. On the other side, if the Wicked be in the right, he is not happy; if he mistakes, he is infinitely miserable. Must it not be a most manifest wrong Judgment, that does not presently see, to which side, in this Case, the Preference is to be given? I have foreborn to mention any thing of the Certainty, or Probability of a future State, designing here to shew the *wrong Judgment*, that any one must allow he makes upon his own Principles, laid how he pleases, who prefers the short Pleasures of a vicious Life

Life upon any Consideration, whilst he knows, and cannot but be certain, that a future Life is at least possible.

§. 71. To conclude this Enquiry into human Liberty, which as it stood before, I my self from the beginning fearing, and a very judicious Friend of mine, since the Publication, suspecting to have some Mistake in it, though he could not particularly shew it me, I was put upon a stricter Review of this Chapter. Wherein lighting upon a very easy, and scarce observable Slip I had made, in putting one seemingly indifferent Word for another, that Discovery open'd to me this present View, which here, in this *second* Edition, I submit to the learned World, and which in short is this: *Liberty* is a Power to act or not to act, according as the Mind directs. A Power to direct the operative Faculties to Motion or Rest in particular Instances, is that which we call the *Will*. That which in the Train of our voluntary Actions determines the *Will* to any Change of Operation, is some present Uneasiness, which is, or at least is always accompanied with that of *Desire*. Desire is always moved by Evil, to fly it; because a total Freedom from Pain, always makes a necessary part of our Happiness: But every *Good*, nay, every *greater Good*, does not constantly move *Desire*, because it may not make, or may not be taken to make any necessary part of our Happiness. For all that we desire, is only to be happy. But though this general *Desire* of Happiness operates constantly and invariably, yet the Satisfaction of any particular *Desire*, can be suspended from determining the *Will* to any subservient Action, 'till we have maturely examin'd, whether the particular apparent Good, which we then desire, makes a part of our real Happiness, or be consistent or inconsistent with it. The Result of our Judgment upon that Examination, is what ultimately determines the Man, who could not be *free*, if his *Will* were determin'd by any thing, but his own *Desire* guided by his own *Judgment*. I know that Liberty by some, is placed in an *Indifferency* of the Man, antecedent to the Determination of his *Will*. I wish they, who lay so much Stress on such an *antecedent Indifferency*, as they call it, had told us plainly, whether this supposed *Indifferency* be antecedent to the Thought and Judgment of the Understanding, as well as to the Decree of the *Will*. For it is pretty hard to state it between them; *i. e.* immediately after the Judgment of the Understanding, and before the Determination of the *Will*, because the Determination of the *Will* immediately follows the Judgment of the Understanding; and to place Liberty in an *Indif-*

*Recapitulation.*

*ference*, antecedent to the Thought and Judgment of the Understanding, seems to me to place Liberty in a State of Darkness, wherein we can neither see nor say any thing of it; at least it places it in a Subject incapable of it, no Agent being allowed capable of Liberty, but in Consequence of Thought and Judgment. I am not nice about Phrases, and therefore consent to say with those that love to speak so, that Liberty is plac'd in *Indifference*; but 'tis in an *Indifference* that remains after the Judgment of the Understanding; yea, even after the Determination of the *Will*: And that is an Indifference not of the Man; (for after he has once judg'd which is best, *viz.* to do, or forbear, he is no longer indifferent) but an *Indifference* of the operative Powers of the Man, which remaining equally able to operate, or to forbear operating after, as before the Decree of the *Will*, are in a State, which, if one pleases, may be called *Indifference*; and as far as this *Indifference* reaches, a Man is free, and no farther. *V. g.* I have the Ability to move my Hand, or to let it rest, that operative Power is indifferent to move, or not to move my Hand: I am then in that Respect perfectly free. My *Will* determines that operative Power to Rest, I am yet free, because the *Indifference* of that my operative Power to act, or not to act, still remains; the Power of moving my Hand, is not at all impair'd by the Determination of my *Will*, which at present orders Rest; the *Indifference* of that Power to act, or not to Act, is just as it was before, as will appear, if the *Will* puts it to the Trial, by ordering the contrary. But if during the Rest of my Hand, it be seized by a sudden Palsy, the *Indifference* of that operative Power is gone, and with it my Liberty, I have no longer Freedom in that Respect, but am under a Necessity of letting my Hand rest. On the other side, if my Hand be put into Motion by a Convulsion, the *Indifference* of that operative Faculty is taken away by that Motion, and my Liberty in that Case is lost: For I am under a Necessity of having my Hand move. I have added this, to shew in what sort of *Indifference* Liberty seems to me to consist, and not in any other, real or imaginary.

§. 72. True Notions concerning the Nature and Extent of *Liberty*, are of so great Importance, that I hope I shall be pardon'd this Digression, which my Attempt to explain it, has led me into. The *Ideas* of *Will*, *Volition*, *Liberty*, and *Necessity*, in this Chapter of Power, came naturally in my Way. In the former Edition of this Treatise, I gave an Account of my Thoughts concerning them, according to the Light I then had:

And

And now, as a Lover of Truth, and not a Worſhipper of my own Doctrines, I own ſome Change of my Opinion, which I think I have diſcover'd Ground for. In what I firſt writ, I with an unbiaſſed Indifferency followed Truth, whither I thought ſhe led me. But neither being ſo vain as to fancy Infallibility, nor ſo diſingenuous as to diſſemble my Miſtakes, for fear of blemiſhing my Reputation, I have with the ſame ſincere Deſign for Truth only, not been aſham'd to publiſh what a ſeverer Enquiry has ſuggeſted. It is not impoſſible, but that ſome may think my former Notions right, and ſome (as I have already found) theſe later; and ſome neither. I ſhall not at all wonder at this Variety in Men's Opinions: Impartial Deductions of Reaſon in controverted Points being ſo very rare, and exact ones in abſtract Notions not ſo very eaſy, eſpecially if of any Length. And therefore, I ſhould think my ſelf not a little beholding to any one, who would upon theſe, or any other Grounds, fairly clear this Subject of *Liberty* from any Difficulties that may yet remain.

Before I cloſe theſe Chapter, it may perhaps be to our Purpoſe, and help to give us clearer Conceptions about *Power*, if we make our Thoughts take a little more exact Survey of *Action*. I have ſaid above, that we have *Ideas* but of two ſorts of *Action*, viz. *Motion* and *Thinking*. Theſe, in Truth, though called and counted *Actions*, yet, if nearly conſidered, will not be found to be always perfectly ſo. For, if I miſtake not, there are Inſtances of both kinds, which, upon due Conſideration, will be found rather *Paſſions* than *Actions*, and conſequently ſo far the Effects barely of paſſive Powers in thoſe Subjects, which yet on their Account are thought *Agents*. For in theſe Inſtances, the Subſtance that hath Motion, or Thought, receives the Impreſſion, whereby it is put into that *Action* purely from without, and ſo acts meerly by the Capacity it has to receive ſuch an Impreſſion from ſome external Agent; and ſuch a *Power* is not properly an *active Power*, but a meer paſſive Capacity in the Subject. Sometimes the Subſiſtance, or Agent, puts it ſelf into *Action* by its own Power, and this is properly *active Power*. Whatſoever Modification a Subſtance has, whereby it produces any Effect, that is called *Action*; *v. g.* a ſolid Subſtance by Motion operates on, or alters the ſenſible *Ideas* of another Subſtance, and therefore this Modification of Motion, we call Action. But yet this Motion in that ſolid Subſtance is, when rightly conſidered, but a Paſſion, if it received it only from ſome external Agent. So that the *active Power* of Motion,

is

is in no Substance which cannot begin Motion in it self, or in another Substance, when at Rest. So likewise in *Thinking*, a Power to receive *Ideas*, or Thoughts, from the Operation of any external Substance, is called a *Power* of Thinking: But this is but a *passive Power*, or Capacity. But to be able to bring into View *Ideas* out of Sight, at one's own Choice, and to compare which of them one thinks fit, this is an *active Power*. This Reflection may be of some Use to preserve us from Mistakes about *Powers* and *Actions*, which Grammar, and the common Frame of Languages, may be apt to lead us into: Since what is signified by *Verbs* that Grammarians call *active*, does not always signify *Action*; *v. g.* this Proposition, I see the Moon, or a Star, or I feel the Heat of the Sun, though expressed by a *Verb active*, does not signify any *Action* in me, whereby I operate on those Substances; but the Reception of the *Ideas* of Light, Roundness and Heat, wherein I am not active, but barely passive, and cannot in that Position of my Eyes, or Body, avoid receiving them. But when I turn my Eyes another way, or remove my Body out of the Sun-beams, I am properly active; because of my own Choice, by a Power within my self, I put my self into that Motion. Such an *Action*, is the Product of *active Power*.

§. 73. And thus I have, in a short Draught, given a View of our *original Ideas*, from whence all the rest are derived, and of which they are made up; which, if I would consider, as a Philosopher, and examine on what Causes they depend, and of what they are made, I believe they all might be reduced to these very few primary, and original ones, *viz.*

*Extension*,
*Solidity*,
*Mobility*, or the Power of being moved;

which by our Senses we receive from Body:

*Perceptivity*, or the Power of Perception, or Thinking;
*Motivity*, or the Power of moving;

which by Reflection we receive from our Minds. I crave leave to make Use of these two new Words, to avoid the Danger of being mistaken in the Use of those which are equivocal. To which if we add

*Existence*,
*Duration*,
*Number*;

which belong both to the one, and the other, we have, perhaps, all the original *Ideas*, on which the rest depend. For by

these,

these, I imagine, might be explained the Nature of Colours, Sounds, Tastes, Smells, and all other *Ideas*, we have, if we had but Faculties acute enough to perceive the severally modified Extensions, and Motions of these minute Bodies, which produce those several Sensations in us. But my present Purpose being only to enquire into the Knowledge the Mind has of Things, by those *Ideas* and Appearances, which *God* has fitted it to receive from them, and how the Mind comes by that Knowledge, rather than into their Causes, or Manner of Production, I shall not, contrary to the Design of this Essay, set my self to enquire Philosophically into the peculiar Constitution of Bodies, and the Configuration of Parts, whereby they have the Power to produce in us the *Ideas* of their sensible Qualities: I shall not enter any farther into that Disquisition; it sufficing to my Purpose to observe, That Gold or Saffron, has a Power to produce in us the *Idea* of Yellow; and Snow or Milk, the *Idea* of White; which we can only have by our Sight, without examining the Texture of the Parts of those Bodies, or the particular Figures, or Motion of the Particles, which rebound from them, to cause in us that particular Sensation: Though when we go beyond the bare *Ideas* in our Minds, and would enquire into their Causes, we cannot conceive any thing else to be in any sensible Object, whereby it produces different *Ideas* in us, but the different Bulk, Figure, Number, Texture, and Motion of its insensible Parts.

## CHAP. XXII.

### *Of Mixed Modes.*

§. 1. HAving treated of *simple Modes* in the foregoing Chapters, and given several Instances of some of the most considerable of them, to shew what they are, and how we come by them; we are now in the next place to consider those we call *mixed Modes*, such are the complex *Ideas*, we mark by the Names *Obligation*, *Drunkenness*, a *Lie*, &c. which consisting of several Combinations of simple *Ideas* of different Kinds, I have called *mixed Modes*, to distinguish them from the more simple Modes, which consist only of simples *Ideas* of the same kind. *Mixed Modes, what.*

kind. These mixed Modes being also such Combinations of simple *Ideas*, as are not looked upon to be Characteristical Marks of any real Beings that have a steady Existence, but scattered and independent *Ideas*, put together by the Mind, are thereby distinguished from the complex *Ideas* of Substances.

*Made by the Mind.*

§. 2. That the Mind, in respect of its simple *Ideas*, is wholly passive, and receives them all from the Existence and Operations of Things, such as Sensation or Reflection offers them, without being able to make any one *Idea*, Experience shews us. But if we attentively consider these *Ideas* I call *mixed Modes*, we are now speaking of, we shall find their Original quite different. *The Mind* often *exercises an active Power in making these* several *Combinations*: For it being once furnished with simple *Ideas*, it can put them together in several Compositions, and so make Variety of complex *Ideas*, without examining whether they exist so together in Nature. And hence, I think, it is, that these *Ideas* are called *Notions*; as if they had their Original, and constant Existence, more in the Thoughts of Men, than in the Reality of things; and to form such *Ideas*, it sufficed, that the Mind puts the Parts or them together, and that they were consistent in the Understanding, without considering whether they had any real Being: Though I do not deny, but several of them might be taken from Observation, and the Existence of several simple *Ideas* so combined, as they are put together in the Understanding. For the Man who first framed the *Idea* of *Hypocrisy*, might have either taken it at first from the Observation of one, who made shew of good Qualities, which he had not; or else have framed that *Idea* in his Mind, without having any such Pattern to fashion it by. For it is evident, that in the beginning of Languages and Societies of Men, several of those complex *Ideas*, which were consequent to the Constitutions established amongst them, must needs have been in the Minds of Men, before they existed any where else; and that many Names that stood for such complex *Ideas*, were in Use, and to those *Ideas* framed, before the Combinations they stood for, ever existed.

*Sometimes got by the Explication of their Names.*

§. 3. Indeed, now that Languages are made, and abound with Words standing for such Combinations, *an usual way of getting these complex* Ideas, *is by the Explication of those Terms that stand for them.* For consisting of a Company of simple *Ideas*, combined, they may by Words standing for those simple

ple *Ideas*, be repreſented to the Mind of one who underſtands thoſe Words, though that complex Combination of ſimple *Ideas* were never offered to his Mind by the real Exiſtence of things. Thus a Man may come to have the *Idea* of *Sacriledge* or *Murther*, by enumerating to him the ſimple *Ideas* which theſe Words ſtand for, without ever ſeeing either of them committed.

*The Name ties the Parts of mixed Modes into one Idea.*

§. 4. Every *mixed Mode* conſiſting of many diſtinct ſimple *Ideas*, it ſeems reaſonable to enquire, *whence it has its Unity*; and how ſuch a preciſe Multitude comes to make but one *Idea*, ſince that Combination does not always exiſt together in Nature? To which I anſwer, It is plain, it has its Unity from an Act of the Mind combining thoſe ſeveral ſimple *Ideas* together, and conſidering them as one complex one, conſiſting of thoſe Parts; and the Mark of this Union, or that which is looked on generally to compleat it, is one Name given to that Combination. For 'tis by their Names, that Men commonly regulate their Account of their diſtinct Species of mixed Modes, ſeldom allowing or conſidering any Number of ſimple *Ideas*, to make one complex one, but ſuch Collections as there be Names for. Thus, though the killing of an old Man be as fit in Nature to be united into one complex *Idea*, as the killing a Man's Father; yet, there being no Name ſtanding preciſely for the one, as there is the Name of *Parricide* to mark the other, it is not taken for a particular complex *Idea*, nor a diſtinct Species of Actions, from that of killing a young Man, or any other Man.

*The Cauſe of making mixed Modes.*

§. 5. If we ſhould enquire a little farther, to ſee *what* it is, that *occaſions Men to make ſeveral Combinations of ſimple* Ideas into diſtinct, and, as it were, ſettled *Modes*, and neglect others, which in the Nature of Things themſelves, have as much an Aptneſs to be combined, and make diſtinct *Ideas*, we ſhall find the Reaſon of it to be the End of Language; which being to Mark or communicate Mens Thoughts to one another, with all the Diſpatch that may be, they uſually make ſuch Collections of *Ideas* into complex Modes, and affix Names to them, as they have frequent Uſe of in their way of Living and Converſation, leaving others, which they have but ſeldom an Occaſion to Mention, looſe and without Names, that tie them together: They rather chuſing to enumerate (when they have need) ſuch *Ideas* as make them up, by the particular Names that ſtand for them, than to trouble their Memories by multiplying of complex *Ideas* with

with Names to them, which they ſhall ſeldom or never have any Occaſion to make uſe of.

*Why Words in one Language, have none anſwering in another.*

§. 6. This ſhews us *how it comes to paſs, that there are in every Language many particular Words, which cannot be rendred by any one ſingle Word of another.* For the ſeveral Faſhions, Cuſtoms, and Manners of one Nation, making ſeveral Combinations of *Ideas* familiar and neceſſary in one, which another People have had never any Occaſion to make, or, perhaps, ſo much as take notice of, Names come of courſe to be annexed to them, to avoid long Periphraſes in things of daily Converſation; and ſo they become ſo many diſtinct complex *Ideas* in their Minds. Thus ὁσρφισμὸς amongſt the *Greeks*, and *Proſcriptio* amongſt the *Romans*, were Words which other Languages had no Names that exactly anſwered, becauſe they ſtood for complex *Ideas*, which were not in the Minds of the Men of other Nations. Where there was no ſuch Cuſtom, there was no Notion of any ſuch Actions; no Uſe of ſuch Combinations of *Ideas*, as were united, and, as it were, tied together by thoſe Terms: And therefore in other Countries there were no Names for them.

*And Languages change.*

§. 7. Hence alſo we may ſee the Reaſon, *Why Languages conſtantly change*, take up new, and lay by old Terms. Becauſe change of Cuſtoms and Opinions bringing with it new Combinations of *Ideas*, which it is neceſſary frequently to think on, and talk about, new Names, to avoid long Deſcriptions, are annexed to them; and ſo they become new Species of complex Modes. What a number of different *Ideas* are by this Means wrapped up in one ſhort Sound, and how much of our Time and Breath is thereby ſaved, any one will ſee, who will but take the Pains to enumerate all the *Ideas* that either *Reprieve* or *Appeal* ſtand for; and inſtead of either of thoſe Names, uſe a Periphraſis, to make any one underſtand their Meaning.

*Mixed Modes, where they exiſt.*

§. 8. Though I ſhall have Occaſion to conſider this more at large, when I come to treat of Words, and their Uſe; yet I could not avoid to take thus much notice here of the Names of *mixed Modes*, which being fleeting, and tranſient Combinations of ſimple *Ideas*, which have but a ſhort Exiſtence any where, but in the Minds of Men, and there too have no longer any Exiſtence, than whilſt they are thought on, *have not ſo much any where the Appearance of a conſtant and laſting Exiſtence, as in their Names:*

Which

Which are therefore, in these sort of *Ideas*, very apt to be taken for the *Ideas* themselves. For if we should enquire where the *Idea* of a *Triumph*, or *Apotheosis* exists, it is evident their could neither of them exist altogether any where in the things themselves, being Actions that required Time to their Performance, and so could never all exist together: And as to the Minds of Men, where the *Ideas* of these Actions are supposed to be lodged, they have there too a very uncertain Existence; and therefore we are apt to annex them to the Names that excite them in us.

*How we get the Ideas of mixed Modes.*

§. 9. There are therefore *three ways whereby we get the complex* Ideas *of mixed Modes.* 1. By Experience and *Observation* of things themselves. Thus by seeing two Men Wrestle, or Fence, we get the *Idea* of Wrestling or Fencing. 2. By *Invention*, or voluntary putting together of several simple *Ideas* in our own Minds: So he that first invented Printing, or Etching, had an *Idea* of it in his Mind, before it ever existed. 3. Which is the most usual way, by *explaining the Names* of Actions we never saw, or Notions we cannot see; and by enumerating, and thereby, as it were, setting before our Imaginations all those *Ideas* which go to the making them up, and are the constituent Parts of them. For having by *Sensation* and *Reflection* stored our Minds with simple *Ideas*, and by Use got the Names that stand for them, we can by those Names represent to another any complex *Idea* we would have him conceive; so that it has in it no simple *Ideas*, but what he knows, and has, with us, the same Name for. For all our complex *Ideas* are ultimately resolvable into simple *Ideas*, of which they are compounded, and originally made up, though perhaps their immediate Ingredients, as I may so say, are also complex *Ideas*. Thus the *mixed Mode*, which the Word *Lye* stands for, is made of these simple *Ideas*: 1. Articulate Sounds. 2. Certain *Ideas* in the Mind of the Speaker. 3. Those Words the Signs of those *Ideas*. 4. Those Signs put together by Affirmation or Negation, otherwise than the *Ideas* they stand for, are in the Mind of the Speaker. I think I need not go any farther in the Analysis of that complex *Idea*, we call a *Lye*: What I have said is enough to shew, that it is made up of simple *Ideas*: And it could not be but an offensive Tediousness to my Reader, to trouble him with a more minute Enumeration of every particular simple *Idea*, that goes to this complex one; which, from what has been said, he cannot but be able to make out to himself. The same may be done in all our complex *Ideas* whatsoever; which, however com-

compounded; and decompounded, may at last be resolved into simple *Ideas*, which are all the Materials of Knowledge or Thought we have, or can have. Nor shall we have Reason to fear, that the Mind is hereby stinted to too scanty a number of *Ideas*, if we consider, what an inexhaustible Stock of simple Modes, Number and Figure alone affords us. How far then *mixed Modes*, which admit of the various Combinations of different simple *Ideas*, and their infinite Modes, are from being few and scanty, we may easily imagine. So that before we have done, we shall see, that, no Body need be afraid, he shall not have Scope and Compass enough for his Thoughts to range in, though they be, as I pretend, confined only to simple *Ideas* received from Sensation or Reflection, and their several Combinations.

*Motion, Thinking, and Power, have been most modified.*

§. 10. It is worth our observing, *which of all our simple* Ideas *have been most modified, and had most mixed Modes made out of them, with Names given to them*: And those have been these three; Thinking, and Motion, (which are the two *Ideas* which comprehend in them all Action,) and Power, from whence these Actions are conceived to flow. These simple *Ideas*, I say, of Thinking, Motion, and Power, have been those which have been most modified; and out of whose Modifications have been made most complex Modes, with Names to them. For Action being the great Business of Mankind, and the whole Matter about which all Laws are conversant, it is no wonder, that the several Modes of Thinking and Motion, should be taken notice of, the *Ideas* of them observed, and laid up in the Memory, and have Names assigned to them; without which, Laws could be but ill-made, or Vice and Disorder repressed. Nor could any Communication be well had amongst Men, without such complex *Ideas*, with Names to them: And therefore Men have settled Names, and supposed settled *Ideas*, in their Minds, of Modes of Actions distinguished by their Causes, Means, Objects, Ends, Instruments, Time, Place, and other Circumstances; and also of their Powers fitted for those Actions, *v. g.* Boldness is the Power to speak or do what we intend, before others, without Fear or Disorder; and the *Greeks* call the Confidence of Speaking by a peculiar Name, παῤῥησία: Which Power or Ability in Man, of doing any thing, when it has been acquired by frequent doing the same thing, is that *Idea* we name *Habit*; when it is forward, and ready upon every occasion to break into Action, we *call* it *Disposition*. Thus *Testiness* is a Disposition or Aptness to be Angry.

To

To conclude, Let us examine any *Modes of Action*, v. g. *Consideration* and *Assent*, which are Actions of the Mind; *Running* and *Speaking*, which are Actions of the Body; *Revenge* and *Murther*, which are Actions of both together, and we shall find them but so many *Collections of simple Ideas*, which together make up the complex ones signified by those Names.

*Several words seeming to signify Action, signify but the Effect.*

§. 11. *Power* being the Source from whence all Action proceeds, the Substances wherein these Powers are, when they exert this Power into Act, are called *Causes*; and the Substances which thereupon are produced, or the simple *Ideas* which are introduced into any Subject by the exerting of that Power, are called *Effects*. The *Efficacy* whereby the new Substance or *Idea* is produced, is called, in the Subject exerting that Power, *Action*; but in the Subject, wherein any simple *Idea* is changed or produced, it is called *Passion*: Which Efficacy however various, and the Effects almost infinite, yet we can, I think, conceive it, in intellectual Agents, to be nothing else but Modes of Thinking and Willing; in corporeal Agents, nothing else but Modifications of Motion. I say, I think we cannot conceive it to be any other but these two: For whatever sort of Action, besides these, produces any Effects, I confess my self to have no Notion, nor *Idea* of; and so it is quite remote from my Thoughts, Apprehensions, and Knowledge; and as much in the dark to me as five other Senses, or as the *Ideas* of Colours to a blind Man: And therefore *many Words, which seem to express some Action*, signify nothing of the Action, or *Modus Operandi* at all, *but* barely *the Effect*, with some Circumstances of the Subject wrought on, or Cause, operating, *v. g.* Creation, Annihilation, contain in them no *Idea* of the Action or Manner, whereby they are produced, but barely of the Cause, and the Thing done. And when a Country-man says the Cold freezes Water, though the Word Freezing seems to import some *Action*, yet truly it signifies nothing but the Effect, *viz.* that Water, that was before fluid, is become hard and consistent, without containing any *Idea* of the Action whereby it is done.

*Mixed Modes made also of other* Ideas.

§. 12. I think I shall not need to remark here, that though Power and Action make the greatest part of mixed Modes, marked by Names, and familiar in the Minds and Mouths of Men; yet other simple *Ideas*, and their several Combinations, are *not* excluded; much less, I think, will it be *necessary* for me *to enumerate all the mixed Modes*, which have been settled, with

Names to them. That would be to make a Dictionary of the greatest part of the Words made Use of in Divinity, Ethicks, Law, and Politicks, and several other Sciences. All that is requisite to my present Design, is, to shew what sort of *Ideas* those are which I call *mixed Modes*; how the Mind comes by them; and that they are Compositions made up of simple *Ideas* got from Sensation and Reflection; which, I suppose, I have done.

## CHAP. XXIII.

### *Of our Complex* Ideas *of Substances.*

*Ideas of Substances, how made.*

§. 1. THE Mind being, as I have declared, furnished with a great Number of the simple *Ideas*, conveyed in by the *Senses*, as they are found in exteriour things, or by *Reflection* on its own Operations, takes Notice also, that a certain Number of these simple *Ideas* go constantly together; which being presumed to belong to one thing, and Words being suited to common Apprehensions, and made Use of for quick Dispatch, are called, so united in one Subject, by one Name; which, by Inadvertency, we are apt afterward to talk of, and consider as one simple *Idea*, which indeed is a Complication of many *Ideas* together: Because, as I have said, not imagining how these simple *Ideas* can subsist by themselves, we accustom our selves to suppose some *Substratum*, wherein they do subsist, and from which they do result; which therefore we call *Substance*. *

§. 2.

* This Section, which was intended only to shew how the Individuals of distinct Species of Substances came to be look'd upon as simple *Ideas*, and so to have simple Names, *viz.* from the supposed simple *Substratum* or *Substance*, which was look'd upon as the thing it self in which inhere, and from which resulted that Complication of *Ideas* by which it was represented to us, hath been mistaken for an Account of the *Idea* of Substance in general; and as such hath been reprehended in these Words: *But how comes the general* Idea *of Substance, to be framed in our Minds? Is this by abstracting and inlarging simple* Ideas? *No*, 'but it is by a Complication of 'many simple *Ideas* together: Because not imagining how these simple 'Ideas can subsist by themselves, we accustom our selves to suppose some

'Sub-

§. 2. So that if any one will examine himſelf concerning his *Notion of pure Subſtance in general*, he will find he has no other *Idea* of it at all, but only a Suppoſition of he knows not what Support of ſuch Qualities, which are capable of producing ſimple *Ideas* in us; which Qualities are commonly called Accidents. If any one ſhould be asked, what is the Subject wherein Colour or Weight inheres, he would have nothing to ſay, but the ſolid extended Parts: And if he were demanded what is it, that that Solidity and Extenſion inhere in, he would not be in a much better Caſe, than the *Indian* before-mentioned, who, ſaying that the World was ſupported by a great Elephant, was asked, what the Elephant reſted on? to which his Anſwer was, a great Tortoiſe: But being again preſſed to know what gave

*Our Idea of Subſtance in general.*

---

'*Subſtratum*, wherein they do ſubſiſt, and from whence they do reſult; 'which therefore we call Subſtance. *And is this all indeed, that is to be ſaid for the Being of Subſtance*, That we accuſtom our ſelves to ſuppoſe a *Subſtratum? Is that Cuſtom grounded upon true Reaſon, or not? If not, then Accidents or Modes muſt ſubſiſt of themſelves; and theſe ſimple* Ideas *need no Tortoiſe to ſupport them: For Figures and Colours, &c. would do well enough of themſelves, but for ſome Fancies Men have accuſtomed themſelves to.*

To which Objection of the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, our Author * anſwers thus: Herein your Lordſhip ſeems to charge me with two Faults: One, *That I make the general* Idea *of Subſtance to be framed, not by abſtracting and inlarging ſimple* Ideas, *but by a Complication of many ſimple* Ideas *together*: The other, as it I had ſaid, The *Being of Subſtance* had no other Foundation but the Fancies of Men.

* *In his firſt Letter to that Biſhop, P.* 27, &c.

As to the firſt of theſe, I beg leave to remind your Lordſhip, That I ſay in more Places than one, and particularly *Book* 3. *chap.* 3. §. 6. and *Book* 1. *chap.* 11. § 9. where *ex profeſſo*, I treat of Abſtraction and general *Ideas*, That they are all made by abſtracting, and therefore could not be underſtood to mean, that that of Subſtance was made any other way; however, my Pen might have ſlipt, or the Negligence of Expreſſion, where I might have ſomething elſe than the general *Idea* of Subſtance in View, might make me ſeem to ſay ſo.

That I was not ſpeaking of the *general* Idea *of Subſtance*, in the Paſſage your Lordſhip quotes, is manifeſt from the Title of that Chapter which is, *Of the complex* Ideas *of Subſtances*. And the firſt *Section* of it, which your Lordſhip cites for thoſe Words, you have ſet down.

In which Words I do not obſerve any that deny the *general Idea of Subſtance* to be made by Abſtraction; nor any that ſay, it is made *by a Complication of many ſimple Ideas together*. But ſpeaking in that place of the Ideas

gave Support to the broad-back'd Tortoise, replied, something, he knew not what. And thus here, as in all other Cases, where we use Words without having clear and distinct *Ideas*, we talk like Children; who being questioned what such a thing is, which they know not, readily give this satisfactory Answer, That it is *something*; which in Truth signifies no more, when so used, either by Children or Men, but that they know not what; and that the thing they pretend to know, and talk of, is what they have no distinct *Idea* of at all, and so are perfectly ignorant of it, and in the dark. The *Idea* then we have, to which we give the general Name Substance, being nothing but the supposed, but unknown Support of those Qualities, we find existing, which we imagine cannot subsist, *sine re substante*, without something to support them, we call that Support *Substantia*; which, according

---

of distinct Substances, such as Man, Horse, Gold, *&c.* I say they are made up of certain Combinations of simple Ideas, which Combinations are looked upon, each of them, as one simple Idea, tho' they were many; and we call it by one Name of *Substance*, though made up of Modes, from the Custom of supposing a *Substratum*, wherein that Combination does subsist. So that in this Paragraph I only give an Account of the Idea of distinct Substances, such as *Oak*, *Elephant*, *Iron*, &c. how, though they are made up of distinct Complications of Modes, yet they are looked on as one Idea, called by one Name, as making distinct sorts of Substances.

But that my Notion of *Substance in general*, is quite different from these, and has no such Combination of simple *Ideas* in it, is evident from the immediate following Words, where I say: † 'The *Idea* of *pure Substance in general*, is only a Supposition of we know 'nor what Support of such Qualities as are capable of pro- 'ducing simple *Ideas* in us. And these I plainly distinguish all along, particularly where I say, 'Whatever therefore be the secret and 'abstract Nature of Substance in general, all the *Ideas* we have of particular distinct Substances, are nothing but several Combinations of simple 'Ideas, co-existing in such, tho' unknown Cause of their Union, as makes 'the whole subsist of it self.

† *B.* II *c.* 23. §. 2.

The other thing laid to my Charge, is, as if I took the *Being of Substance* to be doubtful, or render'd it so by the imperfect and ill grounded *Idea* I have given of it. To which I beg leave to say, That I ground not the *Being*, but the *Idea* of Substance, on our accustoming our selves to suppose some *Substratum*; for 'tis of the *Idea* alone I speak there, and not of the *Being of Substance*. And having every where affirmed and built upon it, That a Man is a Substance, I cannot be supposed to question or doubt of the *Being of Substance*, 'till I can question or doubt of my own *Being*. Farther, I say, 'Sensation convinces us, that there 'are solid, extended Substances, and Reflection, that there

*Ib.* §. 29.

'are

cording to the true Import of the Word, is in plain *English*, *standing under*, or *upholding*. *

§. 3. An obscure and relative *Idea* of Substance in general, being thus made, we come to have the *Ideas of particular sorts of Substances*, by collecting such Combinations of simple *Ideas*, as are by Experience and Observation of Mens Senses, taken notice of to exist together, and are therefore supposed to flow from the particular internal Constitution, or unknown Essence of that Substance. Thus we come to have the *Ideas* of a Man, Horse, Gold, Water, &c. of which Substances, whether any one has any other clear *Idea*, farther than of certain simple *Ideas* co-existing together, *Of the Sorts of Substances.*

---

' are thinking ones. So that I think the *Being of Substance* is not shaken by what I have said: And if the *Idea* of it should be yet (the *Being* of things depending not on our *Ideas*) the *Being of Substance* would not be at all shaken by my saying, We had but an obscure imperfect *Idea* of it, and that that *Idea* came from our accustoming our selves to suppose some *Substratum*; or indeed, if I should say, We had no *Idea* of Substance at all. For a great many things may be, and are granted have a *Being*, and be in Nature, of which we have no *Ideas*. For Example: It cannot be doubted but there are distinct Species of separate Spirits, of which yet we have no distinct *Ideas* at all: It cannot be questioned but Spirits have Ways of communicating their Thoughts, and yet we have no *Idea* of it at all.

The *Being* then of *Substance* being safe and secure, notwithstanding any thing I have said, let us see whether the *Idea* of it be not so too. Your Lordship asks, with Concern, *And is this all indeed that is to be said for the Being* (if your Lordship please, let it be the *Idea*) *of Substance*, that we accustom our selves to suppose a *Substratum? Is that Custom grounded upon true Reason, or no?* I have said, that it is grounded upon this, That ' we cannot *conceive* how simple *Ideas* of sensible Qualities ' should subsist alone; and therefore we suppose them to *B.* II. c. 23. ' exist in, and to be supported by some common Subject; § 4. ' which Support, we denote by the Name *Substance*. Which, I think, is a true *Reason*, because it is the same your Lordship grounds the Supposition of a *Substratum* on, in this very Page; even on the *Repugnancy to our Conceptions, that Modes and Accidents should subsist by themselves*. So that I have the good Luck to agree here with your Lordship: And consequently conclude, I have your Approbation in this, That the *Substratum* to Modes or Accidents, which is our *Idea* of Substance in general, is founded in this, That ' we cannot conceive how Modes or Accidents can subsist by ' themselves.

* From this Paragraph, there hath been raised an Objection by the Bishop of *Worcester*, as if our Author's Doctrine here concerning *Ideas*, *had almost discarded Substance out of the World*. His Words in this second Paragraph,

ther, I appeal to every one's own Experience. 'Tis the ordinary Qualities, observable in Iron, or a Diamond, put together, that make the true complex *Idea* of those Substances, which a Smith, or a Jeweller, commonly knows better than a Philosopher; who, whatever substantial Forms he may talk of, has no other *Idea* of those Substances, than what is framed by a Collection of those simple *Ideas* which are to be found in them; only we must take notice, that our complex *Ideas* of Substances, besides all these simple *Ideas* they are made up of, have always the confused *Idea* of *something* to which they belong, and in which they subsist: And therefore when we speak of any sort of Substance, we say it is a *thing* having such or such Qualities, as Body is a *thing* that is extended, figured, and capable of Motion; a Spirit, a *thing* capable of thinking; and so Hardness, Friability,

---

ragraph, being brought to prove, that he is one of the *Gentlemen of this new way of Reasoning, that have almost discarded Substance out of the reasonable part of the World.* To which our Author replies:

* *In his first Letter to that Bishop, P. 6. &c.*

* This, my Lord, is an Accusation, which your Lordship will pardon me, if I do not readily know what to plead to, because I do not understand what is almost *to discard Substance out of the reasonable part of the World.* If your Lordship means by it, That I deny, or doubt, that there is in the World any such Thing as Substance, that your Lordship will acquit me of, when your Lordship looks again in this 23*d.* Chapter of the second Book, which you have cited more than once, where you will find these Words, §. 4. 'When we talk or think of any particular sort of corporeal 'Substances, as Horse, Stone, &c. tho' the Idea we have of either of them, 'be but the Complication or Collection of those several simple Ideas of sen'sible Qualities, which we use to find united in the Thing, called Horse or 'Stone; yet because we cannot conceive how they should subsist alone, nor one 'in another, we suppose them existing in, and supported by some common 'Subject, which Support we denote by the Name Substance; tho' it be cer'tain, we have no clear or distinct Idea of that thing we suppose a Sup'port. And again, §. 5. 'The same happens concerning the Operations 'of the Mind, viz. Thinking, Reasoning, Fearing, &c. which we consider'ing not to subsist of themselves, nor apprehending how they can belong to 'Body, or be produced by it, are apt to think those the Actions of some other 'Substance, which we call Spirit, whereby yet it is evident, that having 'no other Idea or Notion of Matter, but something wherein those many sim'ple Qualities, which affect our Senses, do subsist, by supposing a Substance, 'wherein Thinking, Knowing, Doubting, and a Power of Moving, &c. do 'subsist. We have as clear a Notion of the Nature or Substance of Spirit, 'as we have of a Body; tho' one being supposed to be (without knowing 'what it is) the Substratum of those simple Ideas we have from without;

'and

Friability, and Power to draw Iron, we say, are Qualities to be found in a Loadstone. These, and the like Fashions of speaking, intimate, that the Substance is supposed always *something* besides the Extension, Figure, Solidity, Motion, Thinking, or other observable *Ideas*, though we know not what it is.

*No clear* Idea *of Substance in general.*

§. 4. Hence, when we talk or think of any particular sort of corporeal Substances, as *Horse*, *Stone*, *&c.* though the *Idea* we have of either of them, be but the Complication, or Collection of those several simple *Ideas* of sensible Qualities, which we use to find united in the thing called *Horse* or *Stone*; yet because we cannot conceive how they should subsist alone, nor one in another, we suppose them existing in, and supported by some common Subject; *which Support, we denote by the Name Substance*, though it be certain we have no clear or distinct *Idea* of that *thing* we suppose a Support.

§. 5.

---

' *and the other supposed* (*with a like Ignorance of what it is*) *to be the* ' Substratum *to those Operations, which we experiment in our selves within.* And again, § 6. ' *Whatever therefore be the secret Nature of Substance in* ' *general, all the* Ideas *we have of particular distinct Substances, are no-* ' *thing but several Combinations of simple* Ideas, *co-existing in such, tho'* ' *unknown Cause of their Union, as makes the whole subsist of it self. And* ' *I farther say in the same* Section, ' *That we suppose these Combinations* ' *to rest in, and to be adherent to that unknown, common Subject, which* ' *inheres not in any thing else. And our complex* Ideas *of Substances, besides* ' *all those simple* Ideas *they are made up of, have always the confused* Idea ' *of something, to which they belong, and in which they subsist; and there-* ' *fore when we speak of any sort of Substance, we say it is a Thing having* ' *such and such Qualities; a Body is a Thing that is extended, figured, and* ' *capable of Motion; a Spirit, a Thing capable of Thinking.*

These, and the like Fashions of speaking, intimate, That the Substance is supposed *always something*, besides the Extension, Figure, Solidity, Motion, Thinking, or other observable *Idea*, though we know not what it is.

' Our *Idea* of Body, I say, * is an extended, solid Sub-
' stance; and our *Idea* of our Souls, is of a Substance that
' thinks. So that as long as there is any such thing as
Body or Spirit in the World, I have done nothing towards
the *discarding Substance out of the reasonable part of the World.* Nay, as long as there is any simple *Idea* or sensible Quality left, according to my Way of Arguing, Substance cannot be discarded, because all simple *Ideas*, all Sensible Qualities, carry with them a Supposition of a *Substratum* to exist in and of a Substance where they inhere; and of this that whole Chapter is so full, that I challenge any one who reads it, to think I have *almost*, or one jot *discarded Substance out of the reasonable part of the World.*

* *B.* II. *c.* 23. §. 22.

*As clear an Idea of Spirit, as Body.*

§. 5. The same happens concerning the Operations of the Mind, *viz.* Thinking, Reasoning, Fearing, *&c.* which we concluding not to subsist of themselves, nor apprehending how they can belong to Body, or be produced by it, we are apt to think these the Actions of some other *Substance*, which we call *Spirit*; whereby yet it is evident, that having no other *Idea* or Notion of Matter, but *something* wherein those many sensible Qualities, which affect our Senses, do subsist; by supposing a Substance, wherein *Thinking*, *Knowing*, *Doubting*, and a Power of Moving, *&c.* do subsist, *We have as clear a Notion of the Substance of Spirit, as we have of Body*; the one being supposed to be (without knowing what it is) the *Substratum* to those simple *Ideas* we have from without; and the other supposed (with a like Ignorance of what it is) to be the *Substratum* to those Operations which we experiment in our selves within. 'Tis plain then,

---

And of this *Man*, *Horse*, *Sun*, *Water*, *Iron*, *Diamond*, &c. which I have mentioned of distinct sorts of *Substances*, will be my Witnesses as long as any such thing remain in Being; of which I say, * 'That

* B. II. c. 12. §. 6. 'the Ideas *of Substances are such Combinations of simple* 'Ideas, *as are taken to represent distinct particular Things*, 'subsisting by themselves, *in which the supposed or confused* 'Idea *of Substance is always the first and chief.*

If by *almost discarding Substance out of the reasonable part of the World*, your Lordship means, That I have destroyed, and *almost discarded* the true *Idea* we have of it, by calling it a *Substratum*, * *A Supposition of we know not what Support of such Qualities as*

* B. II. c. 23. §. 1. §. 2. §. 3. *are capable of producing simple* Ideas *in us, an obscure relative* Idea. † *That without knowing what it is, it is that*

† B. II. c. 13. §. 19. *which supports Accidents; so that of Substance, we have no* Idea *of what it is, but only a confus'd, obscure one, of what it does.* I must confess this, and the like I have said of our *Idea* of Substance; and should be very glad to be convinced by your Lordship, or any Body else, that I have spoken too meanly of it. He that would shew me a more clearer and distinct *Idea* of Substance, would do me a Kindness I should thank him for. But this is the best I can hitherto find, either in my own Thoughts, or in the Books of Logicians; for their Account or *Idea* of it, is, that it is *Ens*, or *Res per se Subsistans*, *& Substans Accidentibus*; which in Effect, is no more but that Substance is a *Being* or *Thing*; or in short, *something* they know not what, or of which they have no clearer *Idea*, than that it is *something* which supports Accidents, or other simple *Ideas* or Modes, or an Accident. So that I do not see but *Burgersdicius*, *Sanderson*, and the whole Tribe of *Logicians*, must be reckon'd with *the Gentlemen of this*

*new*

then, that the *Idea* of corporeal *Subſtance* in Matter, is as remote from our Conceptions and Apprehenſions, as that of ſpiritual *Subſtance*, or *Spirit*; and therefore from our not having any Notion of the *Subſtance* of Spirit, we can no more conclude its non-Exiſtence, than we can, for the ſame Reaſon, deny the Exiſtence of Body: It being as rational to affirm, there is no Body, becauſe we have no clear and diſtinct *Idea* of the *Subſtance* of Matter, as to ſay, there is no Spirit, becauſe we have no clear and diſtinct *Idea* of the *Subſtance* of a Spirit.

§. 6. Whatever therefore be the ſecret and abſtract Nature of *Subſtance* in general, all *the* Ideas *we have of particular diſtinct ſorts of Subſtances*, are nothing but ſeveral Combinations of ſimple *Ideas*, co-exiſting in ſuch, though unknown, Cauſe of their Union, as makes the whole ſubſiſt of it ſelf. 'Tis by ſuch Combinations of ſimple *Ideas*, and nothing elſe, that we repreſent particular

*Of the ſorts of Subſtances.*

---

*new Way of Reaſoning, who have almoſt diſcarded Subſtance out of the reaſonable part of the World.*

But ſuppoſing, my Lord, that I, or theſe Gentlemen, Logicians of Note in the Schools, ſhould own, That we have a very imperfect, obſcure, inadequate *Idea* of Subſtance, would it not be a little too hard to charge us with diſcarding Subſtance out of the World? For what *almoſt* diſcarding, and *reaſonable part* of the World, ſignifies, I muſt confeſs I do not clearly comprehend: But let *almoſt*, and *reaſonable part* ſignifie here what they will, for I dare ſay your Lordſhip meant ſomething by them; would not your Lordſhip think you were a little hardly dealt with, if for acknowledging your ſelf to have a very imperfect and inadequate *Idea* of God, or of ſeveral other things which in this very Treatiſe you confeſs our Underſtandings come ſhort in, and cannot comprehend, you ſhould be accuſed to be one of *theſe Gentlemen that have almoſt diſcarded* God, or thoſe other myſterious Things, whereof you contend we have very imperfect and inadequate *Ideas, out of the reaſonable World?* For I ſuppoſe your Lordſhip means by *almoſt diſcarding out of the reaſonable World*, ſomething that is blameable, for it ſeems not to be inſerted for a Commendation; and yet I think he deſerves no Blame, who owns the having imperfect, inadequate, obſcure *Ideas*, where he has no better: However, if it be inferr'd from thence, that either he *almoſt excludes* thoſe Things out of Being, or out of rational Diſcourſe, if that be meant by *the reaſonable World*, for the firſt of theſe will not hold, becauſe the Being of Things in the World depends not on our *Ideas*: The latter indeed is true in ſome Degree, but is no Fault; for it is certain, that where we have imperfect, inadequate, confus'd, obſcure *Ideas*, we cannot diſcourſe and reaſon about thoſe Things ſo well, fully, and clearly, as if we had perfect, adequate, clear, and diſtinct *Ideas*.

Other Objections are made againſt the following parts of this Paragraph, by

cular sorts of *Substances* to our selves; such are the *Ideas* we have of their several Species in our Minds; and such only do we, by their specifick Names, signify to others, *v. g. Man, Horse, Sun, Water, Iron*; upon hearing which Words, every one, who understands the Language, frames in his Mind a Combination of those several simple *Ideas*, which he has usually observed, or fancied to exist together under that Denomination; all which he supposes to rest in, and be, as it were, adherent to that unknown common Subject, which inheres not in any thing else. Though in the mean time it be manifest, and every one upon Enquiry into his own Thoughts, will find that he has no other *Idea* of any *Substance*, *v. g.* let it be *Gold, Horse, Iron, Man, Vitriol, Bread*, but what he has barely of those sensible Qualities, which he supposes to inhere, with a Supposition of such a *Substratum*, as gives, as it were, a Support to those Qualities, or simple *Ideas*, which he has observed to exist united together.

Thus

---

by that Reverend Prelate, *viz.* The Repetition of the Story of the *Indian* Philosopher, and the talking like Children about Substance: To which our Author replies:

Your Lordship, I must own, with great Reason, takes notice, that I *parallel'd more than once* our *Idea* of Substance with the *Indian* Philosophers, He knew not what supported the Tortoise, *&c.*

This Repetition is, I confess, a Fault in exact Writing: But I having acknowledg'd and excus'd it in these Words in my Preface; '*I am not ignorant how little I herein consult my own Reputation, when I knowingly let my Essay go with a Fault so apt to disgust the* most Judicious, who are always *the nicest Readers. And there farther add, That I did not publish my Essay for such great Masters of Knowledge as your Lordship; but fitted it to Men of my own Size, to whom Repetitions might be sometimes useful.* It would not therefore have been besides your Lordship's Generosity (who were not intended to be provoked by this Repetition) to have passed by such a Fault as this, in one who pretends not beyond the lower Rank of Writers. But I see your Lordship would have me exact, and without any Faults; and I wish I could be so, the better to deserve your Lordship's Approbation.

My Saying, '*That when we talk of Substance, we talk like Children; who being ask'd a Question about something, which they know not, readily give this satisfactory Answer*, That it is something; your Lordship seems mightily to lay to Heart in these Words that follow: *If this be Truth of the Case, we must still talk like Children, and I know not how it can be remedied. For if we cannot come at a rational* Idea *of Substance, we can have no Principle of Certainty to go upon in this Debate.*

If

Thus the *Idea* of the *Sun*, What is it, but an Aggregate of those several simple *Ideas*, Bright, Hot, Roundish, having a constant regular Motion, at a certain Distance from us, and, perhaps, some other? As he who thinks and discourses of the *Sun*, has been more or less accurate, in observing those sensible Qualities, *Ideas*, or Properties, which are in that thing, which he calls the *Sun*.

§. 7. For he has the perfectest *Idea* of any of the particular sorts of *Substance*, who has gathered, and put together, most of those simple *Ideas*, which do exist in it, among which are to be reckoned its active Powers, and passive Capacities; which though not simple *Ideas*, yet in this Respect, for Brevity's sake, may conveniently enough be reckoned amongst them. Thus the Power of drawing Iron, is one of the *Ideas* of the complex one of that Substance we call a *Load stone*, and a Power

*Power a great part of our complex Ideas of Substances.*

---

If your Lordship has any better and distincter *Idea* of Substance than mine is, which I have given an Account of, your Lordship is not at all concern'd in what I have there said. But those whose *Idea* of *Substance*, whether a *rational* or not rational *Idea*, is like mine, something he knows not what, must in that, with me, talk like Children, when they speak of something they know not what. For a Philosopher that says, That which supports Accidents, is something he know not what; and a Country-man that says, The Foundation of the great Church at *Harlem*, is supported by something he knows not what; and a Child that stands in the Dark upon his Mother's Muff, and says he stands upon something he knows not what, in this Respect talk all Three alike: But if the Country-man knows, that the Foundation of the Church of *Harlem* is supported by a Rock, as the Houses about *Bristol* are; or by Gravel, as the Houses about *London* are; or by wooden Piles, as the Houses in *Amsterdam* are; it is plain, that then having a clear and distinct *Idea* of the Thing that supports the Church, he does not talk of this Matter as a Child; nor will he of the Support of Accidents, when he has a clearer and more distinct *Idea* of it, than that it is barely *something*. But as long as we think like Children, in Cases where our *Ideas* are no clearer nor distincter than theirs, I agree with your Lordship, That *I know not how it can be remedied*, but that we must talk like them.

Farther, the Bishop asks, Whether there be no Difference between the bare Being of a Thing, and its Subsistence by it self? To which our Author answers, Yes. But what will that do to prove, that upon my Principles we can come to no Certainty of Reason, that there is any such thing as Substance? You seem by this Question to conclude, That the *Idea* of a *Thing that subsists by*

*Mr. Locke's 3d Letter. p.* 381.

Power to be so drawn, is a part of the complex one we call *Iron*; which Powers pass for inherent Qualities in those Subjects. Because every *Substance* being as apt, by the Powers we observe in it, to change some sensible Qualities in other Subjects, as it is to produce in us those simple *Ideas*, which we receive immediately from it, does, by those new sensible Qualities introduced into other Subjects, discover to us to those Powers, which do thereby mediately affect our Senses, as regularly as its sensible Qualities do it immediately, *v. g.* we immediately by our Senses perceive in *Fire* its Heat and Colour; which are, if righty considered, nothing but Powers in it, to produce those *Ideas* in us: We also by our Senses perceive the Colour and Brittleness of *Charcoal*, whereby we come by the Knowledge of another Power in Fire, which it has to change the Colour and Consistency of Wood. By the former Fire immediately, by the latter it mediately discovers to us these several Powers, which therefore we look upon to be a part of the Qualities of Fire, and so make them

---

*by it self*, is a clear and distinct *Idea* of Substance: But I beg leave to ask, Is the *Idea* of the Manner of Subsistence of a Thing, the *Idea* of the Thing it self? If it be not, we may have a clear and distinct *Idea* of the Manner, and yet have none but a very obscure and confused one of the Thing. For Example; I tell your Lordship, that I know a thing that cannot subsist without a Support, and I know another thing that does subsist without a Support, and say no more of them; Can you by having the clear and distinct *Ideas* of having a Support, and not having a Support, say, that you have a clear and distinct *Idea* of the thing that I know which has, and of the thing, that I know which has not a Support? If your Lordship can, I beseech you to give me the clear and distinct *Ideas* of these, which I only call by the general Name, Things, that have or have not Supports: For such there are, and such I shall give your Lordship clear and distinct *Ideas* of, when you shall please to call upon me for them; though I think your Lordship will scarce find them by the general and confused *Idea* of Thing, nor in the clearer and more distinct *Idea* of having, or not having a Support.

To shew a blind Man, that he has no clear distinct *Idea* of Scarlet, I tell him, that is Notion of it, that it is a *Thing* or *Being*, does not prove he has any clear or distinct *Idea* of it; but barely that he takes it to be something, he knows not what. He replies, that he knows more than that, *v. g.* he knows that it subsists, or inheres in another thing; *And is there no Difference*, says he, in your Lordship's Words, *between the bare Being of a thing, and its Subsistence in another?* Yes, say I to him, a great deal, they are very different *Ideas*. But for all that, you have no clear and distinct *Idea* of *Scarlet*, not such a one as I have, who see and know it, and have another kind of *Idea* of it, besides that of Inherence.

Your

them a part of the complex *Ideas* of it. For all those Powers that we take Cognizance of, terminating only in the Alteration of some sensible Qualities, in those Subjects on which they operate, and so making them exhibit to us new sensible *Ideas*; therefore it is that I have reckoned these Powers amongst the simple *Ideas*, which make the complex ones of the sorts of *Substances*; though these Powers considered in themselves, are truly complex *Ideas*. And in this looser Sense, I crave leave to be understood, when I name any of these *Potentialities amongst the simple Ideas*, which we recollect in our Minds, when we think *of particular Substances*. For the Powers that are severally in them, are necessary to be considered, if we will have true distinct Notions of the several sorts of Substances.

§. 8. Nor are we to wonder, that *Powers make a great part of our complex* Ideas *of Substances*; since their secondary Qualities are those, which in most of them serve principally to distinguish Substances one from another, and commonly make a considerable part of the complex *Idea* of the several sorts of them. For our Senses failing us in the Discovery of the Bulk, Texture, and Figure of the minute parts of Bodies, on which their real Constitutions and Differences depend, we are fain to make use of their secondary Qualities, as the Characterical Notes and Marks, whereby to frame *Ideas* of them in our Minds, and distinguish them one from another. All which secondary Qualities, as has been shewn, are nothing but bare Powers. For the Colour and Taste of *Opium*, are, as well as it's Soporifick or Anodyne Virtues, meer Powers depending on its primary Qualities, whereby it is fitted to produce different Operations on different parts of our Bodies. *And why.*

---

Your Lordship has the *Idea* of *subsisting by it self*, and therefore you conclude, you have a clear and distinct *Idea* of the thing that *subsists by it self*; which, methinks, is all one, as if your Country-man should say, he hath an *Idea* of a Cedar of *Lebanon*, that it is a Tree of a Nature, to need no Prop to lean on for its Support; therefore he has a clear and distinct *Idea* of a Cedar of *Lebanon*: Which clear and distinct *Idea*, when he comes to examine, is nothing but a general one of a Tree, with which his indetermined *Idea* of a Cedar, is confounded. Just so is the *Idea* of *Substance*; which, however called clear and distinct, is confounded with the general indetermined *Idea* of *something*. But suppose that the Manner of subsisting by its self, give us a clear and distinct *Idea* of *Substance*, how does that prove, *That upon my Principles we can come to no Certainty of Reason, that there is any such thing as Substance in the World?* Which is the Proposition to be proved.

*Three ſorts of* Ideas *make our complex ones of Subſtances.*

§. 9. *The* Ideas *that make our complex ones of corporeal Subſtances*, are of theſe three ſorts. *Firſt*, The *Ideas* of the primary Qualities of things, which are diſcovered by our Senſes, and are in them even when we perceive them not, ſuch are the Bulk, Figure, Number, Situation, and Motion of the parts of Bodies, which are really in them, whether we take notice of them or no. *Secondly*, The ſenſible ſecondary Qualities, which depending on theſe, are nothing but the Powers thoſe Subſtance have to produce ſeveral *Ideas* in us by our Senſes; which *Ideas* are not in the things themſelves otherwiſe than as any thing is in its Cauſe. *Thirdly*, The Aptneſs we conſider in any Subſtance, to give or receive ſuch Alterations of primary Qualities, as that the Subſtance ſo altered ſhould produce in us different *Ideas* from what it did before; theſe are called active and paſſive Powers, as far as we have any Notice or Notion of them, terminate only in ſenſible ſimple *Ideas*. For whatever Alteration a *Load-ſtone* has the Power to make in the minute Particles of Iron, we ſhould have no Notion of any Power it had at all to operate on Iron, did not its ſenſible Motion diſcover it; and I doubt not, but there are a thouſand Changes, that Bodies we daily handle, have a Power to cauſe in one another, which we never ſuſpect, becauſe they never appear in ſenſible Effects.

*Powers make a great part of our complex* Ideas *of Subſtances.*

§. 10. *Powers* therefore juſtly *make a great part of our complex* Ideas *of Subſtances*. He that will examine his complex *Idea* of Gold, will find ſeveral of its *Ideas*, that make it up, to be only Powers, as the Power of being melted, but of not ſpending it ſelf in the Fire; of being diſſolved in *Aq. Regia*, are *Ideas* as neceſſary to make up our complex *Idea* of Gold, as its Colour and Weight: Which, if duly conſidered, are alſo nothing but different Powers. For to ſpeak truly, Yellowneſs is not actually in Gold; but is a Power in Gold to produce that *Idea* in us by our Eyes, when placed in a due Light: And the Heat, which we cannot leave out of our *Idea* of the Sun, is no more really in the Sun, than the white Colour it introduces into Wax. Theſe are both equally Powers in the Sun, operating, by the Motion and Figure of its inſenſible Parts, ſo on a Man, as to make him have the *Idea* of Heat; and ſo on Wax, as to make it capable to produce in a Man the *Idea* of White.

§. 11.

§. 11. Had we Senses acute enough to discern the minute Particles of Bodies, and the real Constitution on which their sensible Qualities depend, I doubt not but they would produce quite different *Ideas* in us; and that which is now the yellow Colour of Gold, would then disappear, and instead of it, we should see an admirable Texture of parts of a certain Size and Figure. This Microscopes plainly discover to us: For what to our naked Eyes produces a certain Colour, is by thus augmenting the Acuteness of our Senses, discovered to be quite a different thing; and the thus altering, as it were, the Proportion of the Bulk of the minute Parts of a coloured Object to our usual Sight, produces different *Ideas* from what it did before. Thus Sand, or pounded Glass, which is opaque, and white to the naked Eye, is pellucid in a Microscope; and a Hair seen this way, loses its former Colour, and is in great measure pellucid, with a Mixture of some bright sparkling Colours, such as appear from the Refraction of Diamonds, and other pellucid Bodies. Blood to the naked Eye, appear all red; but by a good Microscope, wherein its lesser Parts appear, shews only some few Globules of Red, swimming in a pellucid Liquor; and how these red Globules would appear, if Glasses could be found that yet could magnify them 1000, or 10000 times more, is uncertain.

*The now secondary Qualities of Bodies would disappear, if we could discover the primary ones of their minute Parts.*

§. 12. The infinite wise Contriver of us, and all things about us, hath fitted our Senses, Faculties, and Organs, to the Conveniences of Life, and the Business we have to do here. We are able, by our Senses, to know, and distinguish things; and to examine them so far, as to apply them to our Uses, and several ways to accommodate the Exigences of this Life. We have Insight enough into their admirable Contrivances, and wonderful Effects, to admire and magnify the Wisdom, Power, and Goodness of their Author. Such a Knowledge as this, which is suited to our present Condition, we want not Faculties to attain. But it appears not, that God intended we should have a perfect, clear, and adequate Knowledge of them: That perhaps is not in the Comprehension of any finite Being. We are furnished with Faculties (dull and weak as they are) to discover enough in the Creatures, to lead us to the Knowledge of the Creator, and the Knowledge of our Duty; and we are fitted well enough with Abilities, to provide for

*Our Faculties of Discovery fitted to our State.*

for the Conveniences of Living: These are our Business in this World. But were our Senses alter'd, and made much quicker and accuter, the Appearance and outward Scheme of things would have quite another Face to us; and I am apt to think, would be inconsistent with our Being, or at least Well-being in this part of the Universe, which we inhabit. He that considers how little our Constitution is able to bear a Remove into parts of this Air, not much higher than that we commonly breathe in, will have Reason to be satisfied, that in this Globe of Earth allotted for our Mansion, the All-wise Architect has suited our Organs, and the Bodies that are to affect them, one to another. If our Sense of Hearing were but 1000 times quicker than it is, how would a perpetual Noise distract us. And we should in the quietest Retirement, be less able to sleep or meditate, than in the middle of a Sea-fight. Nay, if that most instructive of our Senses, Seeing, were in any Man 1000, or 100000 times more accute than it is now by the best Microscope, things several Millions of times less than the smallest Object of his Sight now, would then be visible to his naked Eyes, and so he would come nearer the Discovery of the Texture and Motion of the minute Parts of corporeal things; and in many of them, probably get *Ideas* of their internal Constitutions: But then he would be in a quite different World from other People: Nothing would appear the same to him, and others: The visible *Ideas* of every thing, would be different. So that I doubt, whether he, and the rest of Men, could discourse concerning the Objects of Sight; or have any Communication about Colours, their Appearances being so wholly different. And perhaps such a Quickness and Tenderness of Sight could not endure bright Sun-shine, or so much as open Day-light; nor take in but a very small part of any Object at once, and that too only at a very near Distance. And if by the help of such Microscopical Eyes, (if I may so call them,) a Man could penetrate farther than ordinary into the secret Composition, and radical Texture of Bodies, he would not make any great Advantage by the Change, if such an acute Sight would not serve to conduct him to the Market and Exchange; if he could not see things he was to avoid, at a convenient distance, nor distinguish things he had to do with, by those sensible Qualities others do. He that was sharp sighted enough to see the Configuration of the minute Particles of the Spring of a Clock, and observe upon what peculiar Structure and Impulse its elastick Motion depends, would no doubt discover something very admirable: But if Eyes so framed,

framed, could not view at once the hand, and the Characters of the Hour-plate, and thereby at a distance see what a Clock it was, their Owner could not be much benefited by that Acuteness; which, whilst it discovered the secret Contrivance of the Parts of the Machine, made him lose its Use.

*Conjecture about Spirits.*

§. 13. And here give me leave to propose an extravagant Conjecture of mine, *viz.* That since we have some Reason (if there be any Credit to be given to the Report of things, that our Philosophy cannot account for,) to imagine, that Spirits can assume to themselves Bodies of different Bulk, Figure, and Confirmation of Parts. Whether one great Advantage some of them have over us, may not lie in this, that they can so frame, and shape to themselves Organs of Sensation or Perception, as to suit them to their present Design, and the Circumstances of the Object they would consider. For how much would that Man exceed all others in Knowledge, who had but the Faculty so to alter the Structure of his Eyes, that one Sense, as to make it capable of all the several degrees of Vision, which the Assistance of Glasses (casually at first light on) has taught us to conceive? What Wonders would he discover, who could so fit his Eye to all sorts of Objects, as to see, when he pleased, the Figure and Motion of the minute Particles in the Blood, and other Juices of Animals as distinctly as he does, at other times, the Shape and Motion of the Animals themselves. But to us, in our present State, unalterable Organs, so contrived, as to discover the Figure and Motion of the minute Parts of Bodies, whereon depend those sensible Qualities we now observe in them, would, perhaps, be of no Advantage. God has, no doubt, made use so, as is best for us in our present Condition. He hath fitted us for the Neighbourhood of the Bodies that surround us, and we have to do with: And though we cannot, by the Faculties we have, attain to a perfect Knowledge of Things, yet they will serve us well enough for those Ends above-mentioned, which are our great Concernment. I beg my Reader's Pardon, for laying before him so wild a Fancy, concerning the Ways of Perception in Beings above us: But how extravagant soever it be, I doubt whether we can imagine any thing about the Knowledge of Angels, but after this manner, some way or other, in Proportion to what we find and observe in our selves. And though we cannot but allow, that the infinite Power and Wisdom of God, may frame Creatures with a thousand other Faculties, and ways of perceiving things without them, than we have; yet

our Thoughts can go no farther than our own, so impossible it is for us to enlarge our very Guesses beyond the *Ideas* received from our own Sensation and Reflection. The Supposition at least, that Angels do sometimes assume Bodies, needs not startle us, since some of the most ancient, and most learned Fathers of the Church, seemed to believe, that they had Bodies: And this is certain, that their State and Way of Existence, is unknown to us.

*Complex* Ideas *of Substances.*

§. 14. But to return to the Matter in hand, the *Ideas* we have of Substances, and the Ways we come by them; I say, *our specifick* Ideas *of Substances* are nothing else but *a Collection of a certain Number of simple* Ideas, *considered as united in one thing.* These *Ideas* of Substances, though they are commonly called simple Apprehensions, and the Names of them simple Terms; yet in effect, are complex and compounded. Thus the *Idea* which an *English*-man signifies by the Name *Swan*, is white Colour, long Neck, red Beak, black Legs, and whole Feet, and all these of a certain size, with a Power of swimming in the Water, and making a certain kind of Noise, and perhaps to a Man, who has long observed those kind of Birds, some other Properties, which all terminate in sensible simple *Ideas*, all united in one common Subject.

Idea *of Spiritual Substances, as clear as of bodily Substances.*

§. 15. Besides the complex *Ideas* we have of material sensible Substances, of which I have last spoken, by the simple *Ideas* we have taken from those Operations of our own Minds, which we experiment daily in our selves, as Thinking, Understanding, Willing, Knowing, and Power of beginning Motion, *&c.* co-existing in some Substance, we are able to frame *the complex* Idea *of an immaterial Spirit.* And thus, by putting together the *Ideas* of Thinking, Perceiving, Liberty, and Power of moving themselves and other things, we have as clear a Perception and Notion of immaterial Substances, as we have of material. For putting together the *Ideas* of Thinking and Willing, or the Power of moving or quieting corporeal Motion, joined to Substance, of which we have no distinct *Idea*, we have the *Idea* of an immaterial Spirit; and by putting together the *Ideas* of coherent solid Parts, and a Power of being moved, joined with Substance, of which likewise we have no positive *Idea*, we have the *Idea* of Matter. The one is as clear and distinct an *Idea*, as the other: The *Idea* of thinking, and moving a Body, being as clear and distinct

distinct *Ideas*, as the *Ideas* of Extension, Solidity, and being moved. For our *Idea* of Substance is equally obscure, or none at all in both; it is but a supposed, I know not what, to support those *Ideas* we call Accidents. It is for want of Reflection, that we are apt to think, that our Senses shew us nothing but material things. Every Act of Sensation, when duly considered, gives us an equal View of both Parts of Nature, the Corporeal and Spiritual. For whilst I know, by Seeing or Hearing, *&c.* that there is some Corporeal Being without me, the Object of that Sensation, I do more certainly know, that there is some Spiritual Being within me, that sees and hears. This I must be convinced cannot be the Action of bare insensible Matter; nor ever could be without an immaterial thinking Being.

*No* Idea *of abstract Substance.*

§. 16. By the complex *Idea* of extended, figured, coloured, and all other sensible Qualities, which is all that we know of it, we are as far from the *Idea* of the Substance of Body, as if we knew nothing at all: *Nor* after all the Acquaintance and Familiarity, which we imagine we *have* with Matter, and the many Qualities *Men* assure themselves they perceive and know in Bodies, will it, perhaps, upon Examination be found, that they have any *more, or clearer, primary* Ideas *belonging to Body, than they have belonging to immaterial Spirit.*

*The Cohesion of solid Parts, and Impulse, the Primary* Ideas *of Body.*

§. 17. *The primary* Ideas *we have peculiar to Body*, as contra-distinguished to Spirit, *are the Cohesion of solid*, and consequently separable *Parts, and a Power of communicating Motion by Impulse.* These, I think, are the original *Ideas* proper and peculiar to Body; for Figure is but the Consequence of finite Extension.

*Thinking and Motivity, the primary* Ideas *of Spirit.*

§. 18. *The* Ideas *we have* belonging, and *peculiar to Spirit, are Thinking, and Will*, or a Power of putting Body into Motion by Thought, and, which is consequent to it, Liberty. For as Body cannot but communicate its Motion by Impulse, to another Body, which it meets with at rest; so the Mind can put Bodies into Motion, or forbear to do so, as it pleases. The *Ideas* of Existence, Duration, and Mobility, are common to them both.

*Spirits capable of Motion.*

§. 19. There is no Reason why it should be thought strange, that I make *Mobility belong to Spirit*: For having no other *Idea* of Motion, but Change of Distance, with other Beings, that are

conſidered as at reſt; and finding, that Spirits, as well as Bodies, cannot operate but where they are, and that Spirits do operate at ſeveral times in ſeveral places, I cannot but attribute Change of Place to all finite Spirits; (for of the infinite Spirit, I ſpeak not here.) For my Soul being a real Being, as well as my Body, is certainly as capable of changing Diſtance with any other Body, or Being, as Body it ſelf; and ſo is capable of Motion. And if a Mathematician can conſider a certain Diſtance, or a Change of that Diſtance between two Points, one may certainly conceive a Diſtance, and a Change of Diſtance between two Spirits; and ſo conceive their Motion, their Approach or Removal, one from another.

§. 20. Every one finds in himſelf, that his Soul can think, will, and operate on his Body, in the place where that is; but cannot operate on a Body, or in a Place, an hundred Miles diſtant from it. No Body can imagine, that his Soul can think, or move a Body at *Oxford*, whilſt he is at *London*; and cannot but know, that being united to his Body, it conſtantly changes place all the whole Journey, between *Oxford* and *London*, as the Coach or Horſe does, that carries him; and I think may be ſaid to be truly all that while in Motion, or if that will not be allowed to afford us a clear *Idea* enough of its Motion, its being ſeparated from the Body in Death, I think, will: For to conſider it as going out of the Body, or leaving it, and yet to have no *Idea* of its Motion, ſeems to me impoſſible.

§. 21. If it be ſaid by any one, that it cannot change Place, becauſe it hath none, for Spirits are not in *Loco*, but *Ubi*; I ſuppoſe that way of talking, will not now be of much Weight to many in an Age that is not much diſpoſed to admire, or ſuffer themſelves to be deceived by ſuch unintelligible ways of ſpeaking. But if any one thinks there is any Senſe in that Diſtinction, and that it is applicable to our preſent Purpoſe, I deſire him to put it into intelligible *Engliſh*; and then from thence draw a Reaſon to ſhew, that immaterial Spirits are not capable of Motion. Indeed Motion cannot be attributed to GOD, not becauſe he is an immaterial, but becauſe he is an infinite Spirit.

*Idea of Soul and Body compared.*

§. 22. Let us *compare* then our complex *Idea* of an immaterial Spirit, with our complex *Idea* of Body, and ſee whether there be any more Obſcurity in one, than in the other, and in which moſt. Our *Idea* of Body, as I think, is an extended ſolid Subſtance, capable of communicating Motion by Impulſe: And

our

our *Idea* of our Soul, as an immaterial Spirit, is of a Substance that thinks, and has a Power of exciting Motion in Body, by Will, or Thought. These, I think, are *our complex* Ideas *of Soul and Body, as contra-distinguished*; and now let us examine which has most Obscurity in it, and Difficulty to be apprehended. I know, that People, whose Thoughts are immersed in Matter, and have so subjected their Minds to their Senses, that they seldom reflect on any thing beyond them, are apt to say, they cannot comprehend a thinking thing, which, perhaps, is true: But I affirm, when they consider it well, they can no more comprehend an extended thing.

*Cohesion of solid Parts in Body, as hard to be conceived as thinking in a Soul.*

§. 23. If any one say, he knows not what 'tis thinks in him; he means, he knows not what the Substance is of that thinking thing: No more, say I, knows he what the Substance is of that solid thing. Farther, if he says, I know not how he thinks; I answer, Neither knows he how he is extended; how the solid Parts of Body are united, or cohere together to make Extension. For though the Pressure of the Particles of Air may account for the *Cohesion of several Parts of Matter*, that are grosser than the Particles of Air, and have Pores less than the Corpuscles of Air; yet the Weight, or Pressure of the Air, will not explain, nor can be a Cause of the Coherence of the Particles of Air themselves. And if the Pressure of the Æther, or any subtiler Matter than the Air, may unite, and hold fast together the Parts of a Particle of Air, as well as other Bodies; yet it cannot make Bonds for it self, and hold together the Parts that make up every the least Corpuscle of that *Materia subtilis*. So that that Hypothesis, how ingeniously soever explained, by shewing, that the Parts of sensible Bodies are held together by the Pressure of other external insensible Bodies, reaches not the Parts of the Æther it self; and by how much the more evident it proves, that the Parts of other Bodies are held together, by the external Pressure of the Æther, and can have no other conceivable Cause of their Cohesion and Union, by so much the more it leaves us in the dark concerning the Cohesion of the Parts of the Corpuscles of the Æther it self; which we can neither conceive without Parts, they being Bodies, and divisible; nor yet how their Parts cohere, they wanting that Cause of Cohesion, which is given of the Cohesion of the Parts of all other Bodies.

§. 24. But in Truth, *the Pressure of any ambient Fluid*, how great soever, *can be no* intelligible *Cause of the Cohesion of the solid*

*Parts of Matter.* For though such a Pressure may hinder the Avulsion of two polished Superficies one from another, in a Line perpendicular to them, as in the Experiment of two polished Marbles; yet it can never, in the least, hinder the Separation by a Motion, in a Line parallel to those Surfaces. Because the ambient Fluid, having a full Liberty to succeed in each Point of Space, deserted by a lateral Motion, resists such a Motion of Bodies so joined, no more than it would resist the Motion of that Body, were it on all sides invironed by that Fluid, and touched no other Body: And therefore, if there were no other Cause of Cohesion, all Parts of Bodies must be easily separable by such a lateral sliding Motion. For if the Pressure of the Æther be the adequate Cause of Cohesion, where ever that Cause operates not, there can be no Cohesion. And since it cannot operate against such a lateral Separation, (as has been shewed,) therefore in every imaginary Plain, intersecting any Mass of Matter, there could be no more Cohesion, than of two polished Surfaces, which will always, notwithstanding any imaginable Pressure of a Fluid, easily slide one from another. So that perhaps, how clear an *Idea* soever we think we have of the Extension of Body, which is nothing but the Cohesion of solid Parts, he that shall well consider it in his Mind, may have Reason to conclude, That 'tis *as easie* for him *to have a clear* Idea, *how the Soul thinks, as how Body is extended.* For since Body is no farther, nor other wise extended, than by the Union and Cohesion of its solid Parts, we shall very ill comprehend the *Extension* of Body, without understanding wherein consists the Union and Cohesion of its Parts; which seems to me as incomprehensible, as the manner of Thinking, and how it is performed.

§. 25. I allow it is usual for most People to wonder, how any one should find a Difficulty in what they think they every Day observe. Do we not see, will they be ready to say, the Parts of Bodies stick firmly together? Is there any thing more common? And what doubt can there be made of it? And the like, I say, concerning *Thinking*, and *voluntary Motion*: Do we not every Moment experiment it in our selves; and therefore can it be doubted? The Matter of Fact is clear, I confess; but when we would a little nearer look into it, and consider how it is done, there, I think, we are at a loss, both in the one, and the other; and can as little understand how the Parts of Body cohere, as how we our selves perceive, or move. I would have any one intelligibly explain to me, how the Parts

of

of Gold, or Braſs, (that but now in Fuſion were as looſe from one another, as the Particles of Water, or the Sands of an Hour-glaſs,) come in few Moments to be ſo united, and adhere ſo ſtrongly one to another, that the utmoſt Force of Mens Arms cannot ſeparate them: A conſidering Man will, I ſuppoſe, be here at a loſs, to ſatisfie his own, or another Man's Underſtanding.

§. 26. The little Bodies that compoſe that Fluid, we call *Water*, are ſo extremely ſmall, that I have never heard of any one, who by a Microſcope, (and yet I have heard of ſome, that have magnified to 10000; nay, to much above 100,000 times,) pretended to perceive their diſtinct Bulk, Figure, or Motion: And the Particles of *Water* are alſo ſo perfectly looſe one from another, that the leaſt Force ſenſibly ſeparates them. Nay, if we conſider their perpetual Motion, we muſt allow them to have no Coheſion one with another; and yet let but a ſharp Cold come, and they unite, they conſolidate, theſe little Atoms cohere, and are not, without great Force, ſeparable. He that could find the Bonds that tie theſe heaps of looſe little Bodies together ſo firmly; he that could make known the Cement that makes them ſtick ſo faſt one to another, would diſcover a great, and yet unknown Secret: And yet when that was done, would he be far enough from making the Extenſion of Body (which is the Coheſion of its ſolid Parts) intelligible, till he could ſhew wherein conſiſted the Union, or Conſolidation of the Parts of thoſe Bonds, or of that Cement, or of the leaſt Particle of Matter that exiſts. Whereby it appears, that this primary and ſuppoſed obvious Quality of Body, will be found, when examined, to be as incomprehenſible, as any thing belonging to our Minds, and *a ſolid extended Subſtance, as hard to be conceived, as a thinking immaterial one*, whatever Difficulties ſome would raiſe againſt it.

§. 27. For to extend our Thoughts a little farther, that Preſſure, which is brought to explain the Coheſion of Bodies, is as unintelligible as the Coheſion it ſelf. For if Matter be conſidered, as no doubt it is, finite, let any one ſend his Contemplation to the Extremities of the Univerſe, and there ſee what conceivable Hoops, what Bond he can imagine to hold this Maſs of Matter in ſo cloſe a Preſſure together, from whence Steel has its Firmneſs, and the Parts of a Diamond their Hardneſs and Indiſſolubility. If Matter be finite, it muſt have its Extremes; and there muſt be ſomething to hinder it from ſcattering aſunder. If, to avoid this Difficulty, any one will throw

himself into the Supposition and Abyss of infinite Matter, let him consider what Light he thereby brings to the *Cohesion* of Body; and whether he be ever the nearer making it intelligible, by resolving it into a Supposition, the most absurd and most incomprehensible of all other: So far is our Extension of Body (which is nothing but the Cohesion of solid Parts,) from being clearer, or more distinct, when we would enquire into the Nature, Cause, or Manner of it, than the *Idea* of Thinking.

*Communication of Motion by Impulse, or by Thought, equally intelligible.*

§. 28. Another *Idea* we have of Body, is the Power of *Communication of Motion by Impulse*; and of our Souls, the Power of *exciting of Motion by Thought*. These *Ideas*, the one of Body, the other of our Minds, every Days Experience clearly furnishes us with: But if here again we enquire how this is done, we *are equally in the dark*. For in the Communication of Motion by Impulse, wherein as much Motion is lost to one Body, as is got to the other, which is the ordinariest Case, we can have no other Conception, but of the passing of Motion out of one Body into another; which, I think, is as obscure and unconceivable, as how our Minds move or stop our Bodies by Thought; which we every Moment find they do. The Increase of Motion by Impulse, which is observed or believed sometimes to happen, is yet harder to be understood. We have by daily Experience, clear Evidence of Motion produced both by Impulse, and by Thought; but the manner how, hardly comes within our Comprehension; we are equally at a loss in both. So that however we consider Motion, and its Communication either from Body or Spirit, *the Idea which belongs to Spirit, is at least as clear, as that that belongs to Body*. And if we consider the Active Power of moving, or, as I may call it, *Motivity*, it is much clearer in Spirit, than Body, since two Bodies, placed by one another at rest, will never afford us the *Idea* of a Power in the one to move the other, but by a borrowed Motion: Whereas the Mind, every Day, affords *Ideas* of an active Power of moving of Bodies; and therefore it is worth our Consideration, whether active Power be not the proper Attribute of Spirits, and passive Power of Matter. Hence may be conjectured, that created Spirits are not totally separate from Matter, because they are both active and passive. Pure Spirit, *viz.* God, is only active; pure Matter, is only passive; those Beings that are both active and passive, we may judge to partake of both. But be that as it will, I think,

we

we have as many, and as clear *Ideas* belonging to Spirit, as we have belonging to Body, the Substance of each being equally unknown to us; and the *Idea* of Thinking in Spirit, as clear as of Extension in Body; and the Communication of Motion by Thought, which we attribute to Spirit, is as evident as that by Impulse, which we ascribe to Body. Constant Experience makes us sensible of both of these, though our narrow Understandings can comprehend neither. For when the Mind would look beyond those original *Ideas* we have from Sensation or Reflection, and penetrate into their Cause, and manner of Production, we find still it discovers nothing but its own Short-sightedness.

§. 29. To conclude, Sensation convinces us, that there are solid extended Substances; and Reflection, that there are thinking ones: Experience assures us of the Existence of such Beings; and that the one hath a Power to move Body by Impulse, the other by Thought; this we cannot doubt of. Experience, I say, every Moment furnishes us with the clear *Ideas*, both of the one and the other. But beyond these *Ideas*, as received from their proper Sources, our Faculties will not reach. If we would enquire farther into their Nature, Causes, and Manner, we perceive not the Nature of Extension clearer than we do of Thinking. If we would explain them any farther, one is as easie as the other; and there is no more Difficulty to conceive how a Substance we know not, should by Thought set Body into Motion, than how a Substance we know not, should by Impulse set Body into Motion. So that we are no more able to discover wherein the *Ideas* belonging to Body consist, than those belonging to Spirit. From whence it seems probable to me, that the simple *Ideas* we receive from Sensation and Reflection, are the Boundaries of our Thoughts; beyond which, the Mind, whatever Efforts it would make, is not able to advance one jot; nor can it make any Discoveries, when it would pry into the Nature and hidden Causes of those *Ideas*.

Ideas *of Body and Spirit compared.*

§. 30. So that, in short, *the Idea* we have *of Spirit, compared with the* Idea we have *of Body*, stands thus: The Substance of Spirit is unknown to us; and so is the Substance of Body equally unknown to us: Two primary Qualities or Properties of Body, *viz.* solid coherent Parts and Impulse, we have distinct clear *Ideas* of: So likewise we know, and have distinct clear *Ideas* of two primary Qualities or Properties of Spirit, *viz.* Thinking, and a Power or Action; *i. e.* a Power of beginning, or stopping several Thoughts or Motions. We have also the *Ideas* of several

Qualities

Qualities inherent in Bodies, and have the clear distinct *Ideas* of them: Which Qualities, are but the various Modifications of the Extension of cohering solid Parts, and their Motion. We have likewise the *Ideas* of the several Modes of Thinking, *viz.* Believing, Doubting, Intending, Fearing, Hoping; all which, are but the several Modes of Thinking. We have also the *Ideas* of willing, and moving the Body consequent to it, and with the Body it self too; for, as has been shewed, Spirit is capable of Motion.

*The Notion of Spirit involves no more Difficulty in it, than that of Body.*

§. 31. Lastly, If this Notion of immaterial Spirit may have, perhaps, some Difficulties in it, not easy to be explained, we have therefore no more Reason to deny, or doubt the Existence of such Spirits, than we have to deny, or doubt the Existence of Body; because the Notion of Body is cumbered with some Difficulties very hard, and, perhaps, impossible to be explained, or understood by us. For I would fain have instanced any thing in our Notion of Spirit more perplexed, or nearer a Contradiction, than the very Notion of Body includes in it; the Divisibility *in infinitum* of any finite Extension, involving us, whether we grant or deny it, in Consequences impossible to be explicated, or made in our Apprehensions consistent; Consequences that carry greater Difficulty, and more apparent Absurdity, than any thing can follow from the Notion of an immaterial knowing Substance.

*We know nothing beyond our simple Ideas.*

§. 32. Which we are not at all to wonder at, since we having but some few superficial *Ideas* of things, discovered to us only by the Senses from without, or by the Mind, reflecting on what it experiments in it self within, have no Knowledge beyond that, much less of the internal Constitution, and true Nature of Things, being destitute of Faculties to attain it. And therefore experimenting and discovering in our selves Knowledge, and the Power of voluntary Motion, as certainly as we experiment, or discover in things without us, the Cohesion and Separation of solid Parts, which is the Extension and Motion of Bodies; *we have as much Reason to be satisfied with our Notion of immaterial Spirit, as with our Notion of Body; and the Existence of the one, as well as the other.* For it being no more a Contradiction, that Thinking should exist, separate, and independent from Solidity, than it is a Contradiction, that Solidity should exist, separate, and independent from

from Thinking, they being both but simple *Ideas*, independent one from another; and having as clear and distinct *Ideas* in us of Thinking, as of Solidity. I know not why we may not as well allow a thinking thing without Solidity, *i. e. immaterial* to exist, as a solid thing without Thinking, *i. e. Matter* to exist; especially since it is no harder to conceive how Thinking should exist without Matter, than how Matter should think. For whensoever we would proceed beyond these simple *Ideas*, we have from Sensation and Reflection, and dive farther into the Nature of Things, we fall presently into Darkness and Obscurity, Perplexedness and Difficulties; and can discover nothing farther, but our own Blindness and Ignorance. But which ever of these complex *Ideas* be clearest, that of Body, or immaterial Spirit, this is evident, that the simple *Ideas* that make them up, are no other than what we have received from Sensation or Reflection; and so is it of all our other *Ideas* of Substances, even of God himself.

§. 33. For if we examine the *Idea* we have of the incomprehensible supreme Being, we shall find, that we come by it the same Way; and that the complex *Ideas* we have both of God, and separate Spirits, are made up of the simple *Ideas* we receive from *Reflection*: *v. g.* having from what we experiment in our selves, got the *Ideas* of Existence and Duration; of Knowledge and Power; of Pleasure and Happiness; and of several other Qualities and Powers, which it is better to have, than to be without: When we would frame an *Idea* the most suitable we can to the supreme Being, we enlarge every one of these with our *Idea* of Infinity; and so putting them together, make our complex *Idea of God*. For that the Mind has such a Power of enlarging some of its *Ideas*, received from Sensation and Reflection, has been already shewed. Idea *of God.*

§. 34. If I find that I know some few Things, and some of them, or all, perhaps, imperfectly, I can frame an *Idea* of knowing twice as many; which I can double again, as often as I can add to Number; and thus enlarge my *Idea* of Knowledge, by extending its Comprehension to all things existing, or possible: The same also I can do of knowing them more perfectly; *i. e.* all their Qualities, Powers, Causes, Consequences, and Relations, *&c.* till all perfectly known that is in them, or can any way relate to them; and thus frame the *Idea* of infinite or boundless Knowledge: The same may also be done of Power, till we come to that we call infinite; and also of the Duration of Existence, without Beginning or End; and so frame the *Idea* of

of an eternal Being. The Degrees of Extent, wherein we ascribe Existence, Power, Wisdom, and all other Perfection, (which we can have any *Ideas* of) to that Sovereign Being, which we call God, being all boundless and infinite, we frame the best *Idea* of him our Minds are capable of: All which is done, I say, by enlarging those simple *Ideas* we have taken from the Operations of our own Minds, by Reflection; or by our Senses, from exterior Things, to that Vastness, to which Infinity can extend them.

*Idea of God.*

§. 35. For it is Infinity, which joined to our *Ideas* of Existence, Power, Knowledge, *&c.* makes that complex *Idea*, whereby we represent to ourselves the best we can, the supreme Being. For tho' in his own Essence, which certainly we do not know, not knowing the real Essence of a Peble, or a Fly, or of our own selves,) God be simple and uncompounded; yet, I think, I may say we have no other *Idea* of him, but a complex one of Existence, Knowledge, Power, Happiness, *&c.* infinite and eternal: Which are all distinct *Ideas*, and some of them being relative, are again compounded of others; all which being, as has been shewn, originally got from *Sensation* and *Reflection*, go to make up the *Idea* or Notion we have of God.

*No* Ideas *in our complex one of Spirits, but those got from Sensation or Reflection.*

§. 36. This farther is to be observed, that there is no *Idea* we attribute to God, bating Infinity, which is not also a part of our complex *Idea* of other Spirits. Because, being capable of no other simple *Ideas*, belonging to any thing but Body, but those which by Reflection we receive from the Operation of our own Minds, we can attribute to Spirits no other, but what we receive from thence: And all the Difference we can put between them in our Contemplation of Spirits, is only in the several Extents and Degrees of their Knowledge, Power, Duration, Happiness, *&c.* For that in our *Ideas*, as well *of Spirits*, as of other things, we are *restrained to those we receive from Sensation and Reflection*, is evident from hence, that in our *Ideas* of Spirits, how much soever advanced in Perfection, beyond those of Bodies, even to that of Infinite, we cannot yet have any *Idea* of the Manner, wherein they discover their Thoughts one to another: Though we must necessarily conclude, that separate Spirits, which are Beings that have perfecter Knowledge, and greater Happiness than we, must needs have also a perfecter Way of communicating their Thoughts, than we have, who are fain to make

Use

Use of corporeal Signs, and particular Sounds, which are therefore of most general Use, as being the best, and quickest we are capable of. But of immediate Communication, having no Experiment in our selves, and consequently, no Notion of it at all, we have no *Idea*, how Spirits, which use not Words, can with Quickness; or much less, how Spirits that have no Bodies, can be Masters of their own Thoughts, and communicate or conceal them at Pleasure, though we cannot but necessarily suppose they have such a Power.

*Recapitulation.*

§. 37. And thus seen, *what kind of* Ideas *we have of substances of kinds*, wherein they consist, and how we come by them. From whence, I think, it is very evident,

*First*, That all our *Ideas* of the several sorts of Substances, are nothing but Collections of simple *Ideas*, with a Supposition of something, to which they belong, and in which they subsist; though of this supposed something, we have no clear distinct *Idea* at all.

*Secondly*, That all the simple *Ideas*, that thus united in one common *Substratum*, make up our complex *Ideas* of several sorts of the Substances, are no other but such as we have received from *Sensation* or *Reflection*. So that even in those, which we think we are most intimately acquainted with, and come nearest the Comprehension, of our most enlarged Conceptions, cannot reach beyond those simple *Ideas*. And even in those, which seem most remote from all we have to do with, and do infinitely surpass any thing we can perceive in our selves by *Reflection*, or discover by *Sensation* in other things, we can attain to nothing, but those simple *Ideas*, which we originally received from *Sensation* or *Reflection*, as is evident in the complex *Ideas* we have of Angels, and particularly of God himself.

*Thirdly*, That most of the simple *Ideas*, that make up our complex *Ideas* of Substances, when truly considered, are only Powers, however we are apt to take them for positive Qualities; *v. g.* the greatest part of the *Ideas*, that make our complex *Idea* of *Gold*, are Yellowness, great Weight, Ductility, Fusibility, and Solubility, *Aq. Regia*, *&c.* all united together in an unknown *Substratum*; all which *Ideas* are nothing else but so many Relations to other Substances, and are not really in the Gold, considered barely in it self, tho' they depend on those real and primary Qualities of its internal Constitution, whereby it has a Fitness, differently to operate, and be operated on by several other Substances.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XXIV.

## *Of collective* Ideas *of Substances.*

*One Idea.*

§. 1. BEsides these complex *Ideas* of several single Substances, as of Man, Horse, Gold, Violet, Apple, *&c.* the Mind hath also *complex collective Ideas* of Substances; which I so call, because such *Ideas* are made up of many particular Substances considered together, as united into one *Idea*, and which so joined, are looked on as one; *v. g.* the *Idea* of such a Collection of Men as make an Army, though consisting of a great Number of distinct Substances, is as much one *Idea*, as the *Idea* of a Man: And the great collective *Idea* of all Bodies whatsoever signified by the Name World, is as much one *Idea*, as the *Idea* of any the least Particle of Matter in it; is sufficing to the Unity of any *Idea*, that it be considered as one Representation, or Picture, though made up of never so many Particulars.

*Made by the Power of composing in the Mind.*

§. 2. These collective *Ideas* of Substances, the Mind makes by its Power of Composition, and uniting severally, either simple or complex *Ideas* into one, as it does by the same Faculty make the complex *Ideas* of particular Substances, consisting of an Aggregate of divers simple *Ideas*, united in one Substance: And as the Mind, by putting together the repeated *Ideas* of Unity, make the collective Mode, or complex *Idea* of any Number, as a Score, or a Gross, *&c.* So by putting together several particular Substances, it makes collective *Ideas* of Substances, as a Troop, an Army, a Swarm, a City, a Fleet; each of which, every one finds, that he represents to his own Mind, by one *Idea*, in one View; and so under that Notion considers those several Things as perfectly one, as one Ship, or one Atom. Nor is it harder to conceive, how an Army of ten thousand Men should make one *Idea*, than how a Man should make one *Idea*; it being as easie to the Mind, to unite into one the *Idea* of a great Number of Men, and consider it as one as it is to unite into one Particular, all the distinct *Ideas* that make up the Composition of a Man, and consider them altogether as one.

§. 3.

§. 3. Amongst such kind of collective *Ideas*, are to be counted most part of artificial Things, at least such of them as are made up of distinct Substances: And in Truth, if we consider all these collective *Ideas* aright, as *ARMY*, *Constellation*, *Universe*, as they are united into so many single *Ideas*, they are but the artificial Draughts of the Mind, bringing things very remote, and independent on one another, into one View, the better to contemplate, and discourse of them, united into one Conception, and signified by one Name. For there are no things so remote, nor so contrary, which the Mind cannot by this Art of Composition, bring into one *Idea*, as is visible in that signified by the Name *Universe*.

*All artificial Things are collective Ideas.*

---

# CHAP. XXV.

## *Of Relation.*

§. 1. BEsides the *Ideas*, whether simple or complex, that the Mind has of Things, as they are in themselves, there are others it gets from their Comparison one with another. The Understanding, in the Consideration of any thing, is not confined to that precise Object: It can carry any *Idea*, as it were, beyond it self, or, at least, look beyond it, to see how it stands in Conformity to any other. When the Mind so considers one thing, that it does, as it were, bring it to, and set it by another, and carry its View from one to t'other: This is, as the Words import, *Relation* and *Respect*; and the Denominations given to positive Things, intimating that Respect, and serving as Marks to lead the Thoughts beyond the Subject it self denominated, to something distinct from it, are what we call *Relatives*; and the Things so brought together, *Related*. Thus, when the Mind considers *Cajus*, as such a positive Being, it takes nothing into that *Idea*, but what really exists in *Cajus*; *v.g.* when I consider him, as a Man, I have nothing in my Mind, but the complex *Idea* of the Species, Man. So likewise, when I say *Cajus* is a white Man, I have nothing but the bare Consideration of Man, who hath that white Colour. But when I give *Cajus* the Name *Husband*, I intimate some other Person: And when

*Relation, what.*

when I give him the Name *Writer*, I intimate some other thing: In both Cases my Thought is led to something beyond *Cajus*, and there are two things brought into Consideration. And since any *Idea*, whether simple, or complex, may be the Occasion why the Mind thus brings two things together, and, as it were, takes a View of them at once, though still considered as distinct; therefore any of our *Ideas* may be the Foundation of Relation. As in the above-mentioned Instance, the Contract and Ceremony of Marriage with *Sempronia*, is the Occasion of the Denomination or Relation of Husband; and the Colour White, the Occasion why he is said whiter than Free-stone.

*Relations without correlative Terms, not easily perceived.*

§. 2. These, and the like *Relations, expressed by relative Terms, that have others answering them, with a reciprocal Intimation*, as Father and Son, Bigger and Less, Cause and Effect, *are very obvious* to every one, and every Body, at first Sight, perceives the Relation. For Father and Son, Husband and Wife, and such other correlative Terms, seems so nearly to belong one to another, and, through Custom, do so readily chime, and answer one another in Peoples Memories, that upon the naming of either of them, the Thoughts are presently carried beyond the Thing so named; and no Body overlooks, or doubts of a Relation, where it is so plainly intimated. But where Languages have failed to give correlative Names, there the Relation is not always so easily taken notice of. *Concubine* is, no doubt, a relative Name, as well as Wife: But in Languages where this, and the like Words, have not a correlative Term, there People are not so apt to take them to be so, as wanting that evident Mark of Relation, which is between Correlatives, which seem to explain one another, and not to be able to exist, but together. Hence it is, that many of those Names, which duly considered, do include evident Relations, have been called external Denominations. But all Names, that are more than empty Sounds, must signify some *Idea*, which is either in the thing to which the Name is applied; and then it is positive, and is looked on as united to, and existing in the thing to which the Denomination is given: Or else it arises from the Respect the Mind finds in it, to something distinct from it, with which it considers it; and then it includes a Relation.

*Some seemingly absolute Terms contain Relations.*

§. 3. Another sort of *relative Terms* there is, which are not looked on to be either relative, or so much as external Denominations;

tions; *which* yet, under the Form and Appearance of signifying something absolute in the Subject, do conceal a tacit, though less observable Relation. Such are the *seemingly positive* Terms of *Old*, *Great*, *Imperfect*, &c. whereof I shall have Occasion to speak more at large in the following Chapters.

*Relation different from the Things related.*

§. 4. This farther may be observed, That the *Ideas* of Relation may be the same in Men, who have far different *Ideas* of the Things that are related, or that are thus compared; *v. g.* Those who have far different *Ideas* of a *Man*, may yet agree in the Notion of a *Father*: Which is a Notion superinduced to the Substance, or Man, and refers only to an Act of that Thing called Man; whereby he contributed to the Generation of one of his own Kind, let Man be what it will.

*Change of Relation may be without any Change in the Subject.*

§. 5. The *Nature* therefore *of Relation*, consists in the referring or comparing two things one to another; from which Comparison, one or both comes to be denominated. And if either of those things be removed, or cease to be, the Relation ceases, and the Denomination consequent to it, though the other receive in it self no Alteration at all. *V. g. Cajus*, whom I consider to Day as a Father, ceases to be so to morrow, only by the Death of his Son, without any Alteration made in himself. Nay, barely by the Mind's changing the Object, to which it compares any thing, the same thing is capable of having contrary Denominations, at the same time. *V. g. Cajus*, compared to several Persons, may truly be said to be older and younger, stronger and weaker, *&c.*

*Relation only betwixt two Things.*

§. 6. Whatsoever doth, or can exist, or be considered as one thing, is positive: And so not only simple *Ideas*, and Substances, but Modes also are positive Beings; though the Parts, of which they consist, are very often relative one to another; but the whole together consider'd as one thing, and producing in us the complex *Idea* of one thing; which *Idea* is in our Minds, as one Picture, though an Aggregate of divers Parts; and under one Name, it is a positive or absolute Thing, or *Idea*. Thus a Triangle, though the Parts thereof, compared one to another, by *relative*, yet the *Idea* of the whole is a positive absolute *Idea*. The same may be said of a Family, a Tune, *&c.* for there can be no Relation, but betwixt two Things, considered as two Things. There must always be in Relation two *Ideas*, or Things, either in themselves really separate, or con-

sidered as distinct, and then a Ground or Occasion for their Comparison.

*All Things capable of Relation.*

§. 7. Concerning Relation in general, these Things may be considered:

*First*, That there is *no one Thing*, whether simple *Idea*, Substance, Mode, or Relation, or Name of either of them, *which is not capable of almost an infinite Number of* Considerations, in Reference to other Things; and therefore this makes no small part of Mens Thoughts and Words. *V. g.* One single Man may at once be concerned in, and sustain all these following *Relations*, and many more, *viz.* Father, Brother, Son, Grand-father, Grand-son, Father-in-Law, Son-in-Law, Husband, Friend, Enemy, Subject, General, Judge, Patron, Client, Professor, *European*, *English*-Man, Islander, Servant, Master, Possessor, Captain, Superior, Inferior, Bigger, Less, Older, Younger, Contemporary, Like, Unlike, *&c.* to an almost infinite Number: He being capable of as many Relations, as there can be Occasions of comparing him to other Things, in any Manner of Agreement, Disagreement, or Respect whatsoever: For, as I said, *Relation* is a Way of comparing, or considering two Things together; and giving one, or both of them, some Appellation from that Comparison, and sometimes giving even the Relation it self a Name.

*The Ideas of Relations clearer often, than of the Subjects related.*

§. 8. *Secondly*, This farther may be considered concerning *Relation*, That though it be not contained in the real Existence of Things, but something extraneous, and super-induced; yet the *Ideas* which relative Words stand for, are often clearer, and more distinct, than of those Substances to which they do belong. The Notion we have of a Father, or Brother, is a great deal clearer, and more distinct, than that we have of a Man: Or, if you will, *Paternity* is a thing whereof 'tis easier to have a clear *Idea*, than of *Humanity*: And I can much easier conceive what a Friend is, than what G O D. Because the Knowledge of one Action, or one simple *Idea*, is oftentimes sufficient to give me the Notion of a Relation: But to the knowing of any substantial Being, an accurate Collection of sundry *Ideas*, is necessary. A Man, if he compares two Things together, can hardly be supposed not to know what it is, wherein he compares them: So that when he compares any Things together, he cannot but have a very clear *Idea* of that Relation. The *Ideas* then of *Relations*, *are capable* at least *of being more perfect and distinct in our Minds, than those*

*of*

*of Subſtances.* Becauſe it is commonly hard to know all the ſimple *Ideas*, which are really in any Subſtance, but for the moſt part eaſy enough to know the ſimple *Ideas* that make up any Relation I think on, or have a Name for. *V. g.* Comparing two Men, in Reference to one common Parent, it is very eaſy to frame the *Ideas* of Brothers, without having yet the perfect *Idea* of a Man. For ſignificant relative Words, as well as others, ſtanding only for *Ideas*; and thoſe being all either ſimple, or made up of ſimple ones, it ſuffices for the knowing the preciſe *Idea* the relative Term ſtands for, to have a clear Conception of that, which is the Foundation of the Relation; which may be done without having a perfect and clear *Idea* of the thing it is attributed to. Thus having the Notion, that one laid the Egg out of which the other was hatched, I have a clear *Idea* of the Relation of *Dam* and *Chick*, between the two Caſſiowaries in St. *James*'s Park; though, perhaps, I have but a very obſcure and imperfect *Idea* of thoſe Birds themſelves.

*Relations all terminate in ſimple* Ideas.

§. 9. *Thirdly*, Though there be a great Number of Conſiderations, wherein Things may be compared one with another, and ſo a Multitude of *Relations*; yet they *all terminate in*, and are concerned about thoſe *ſimple Ideas*, either of Senſation or Reflection; which I think to be the whole Materials of all our Knowledge. To clear this, I ſhall ſhew it in the moſt conſiderable Relations that we have any Notion of; and in ſome that ſeem to be the moſt remote from *Senſe* or *Reflection*: Which yet will appear to have their *Ideas* from thence, and leave it paſt doubt, that the Notions we have of them, are but certain ſimple *Ideas*, and ſo originally derived from Senſe or Reflection.

*Terms leading the Mind beyond the Subject denominated, are Relative.*

§. 10. *Fourthly*, That *Relation* being the conſidering of one thing with another, which is extrinſical to it, it is evident, that all Words that neceſſarily lead the Mind to any other *Ideas*, than are ſuppoſed really to exiſt in that thing, to which the Word is applied, are *relative Words*. *V. g.* A *Man* *Black*, *Merry*, *Thoughtful*, *Thirſty*, *Angry*, *Extended*; theſe, and the like, are all abſolute, becauſe they neither ſignify nor intimate any thing, but what does, or is ſuppoſed really to exiſt in the Man thus denominated: But *Father*, *Brother*, *King*, *Husband*, *Blacker*, *Merrier*, &c. are Words, which together with the thing they denominate, imply alſo ſomething elſe ſeparate, and exterior to the Exiſtence of that thing.

*Conclusion.* §. 11. Having laid down these Premises concerning *Relation* in general, I shall now proceed to shew, in some Instances, how all the *Ideas* we have of *Relation* are made up, as the others are, only of simple *Ideas*; and that they all, how refined, or remote from Sense soever they seem, terminate at last in simple *Ideas*. I shall begin with the most comprehensive Relation, wherein all Things that do, or can exist, are concerned, and that is the Relation of *Cause* and *Effect*. The *Idea* whereof, how derived from the two Fountains of all our Knowledge, *Sensation* and *Reflection*, I shall in the next place consider.

## CHAP. XXVI.

### *Of Cause and Effect, and other Relations.*

*Whence their Ideas got.* §. 1. IN the Notice that our Senses take of the constant Vicissitude of Things, we cannot but observe, that several particular, both Qualities and Substances, begin to exist; and that they receive this their Existence from the due Application and Operation of some other Being. From this Observation, we get our *Ideas* of *Cause* and *Effect*. That which produces any simple or complex *Idea*, we denote by the general Name *Cause*; and that which is produced, *Effect*. Thus finding, that in that Substance which we call Wax, Fluidity, which is a simple *Idea*, that was not in it before, is constantly produced by the Application of a certain Degree of Heat, we call the simple *Idea* of Heat, in Relation to Fluidity in Wax, the Cause of it, and Fluidity, the Effect. So also finding, that the Substance, Wood, which is a certain Collection of simple *Ideas*, so called by the Application of Fire, is turned into another Substance, called Ashes; *i. e.* another complex *Idea*, consisting of a Collection of simple *Ideas*, quite different from that complex *Idea*, which we call Wood; we consider Fire, in Relation to Ashes, as Cause, and the Ashes, as Effect. So that whatever is considered by us, to conduce or operate, to the producing any particular simple *Idea*, or Collection of simple *Ideas*, whether Substance, or Mode, which did not before exist, hath thereby in our Minds the Relation of a Cause, and so is denominated by us.

§. 2.

§. 2. Having thus, from what our Senſes are able to diſcover, in the Operations of Bodies on one another, got the Notion of *Cauſe* and *Effect*; *viz.* That a *Cauſe* is that which makes any other thing, either ſimple *Idea*, Subſtance or Mode, begin to be; and an *Effect* is that, which had its Beginning from ſome other thing. The Mind finds no great Difficulty, to diſtinguiſh the ſeveral Originals of things into two ſorts. *Creation, Generation, making Alteration.*

*Firſt*, When the thing is wholly made new, ſo that no part thereof did ever exiſt before; as when a new Particle of Matter doth begin to exiſt, *in rerum natura*, which had before no Being, and this we call *Creation*.

*Secondly*, When a thing is made up of Particles, which did all of them before exiſt, but that very thing ſo conſtituted of pre-exiſting Particles, which conſidered altogether, make up ſuch a Collection of ſimple *Ideas*, had not any *Exiſtence* before, as this Man, this Egg, Roſe, or Cherry, *&c.* And this, when referred to a Subſtance, produced in the ordinary Courſe of Nature, by an internal Principle, but ſet on Work by, and received from ſome external Agent, or Cauſe, and working by inſenſible ways, which we perceive not, we call *Generation*; when the Cauſe is extrinſical, and the Effect produced by a ſenſible Separation, or *juxta* Poſition of diſcernible Parts, we call it *Making*; and ſuch are all artificial Things. When any ſimple *Idea* is produced, which was not in that Subject before, we call it *Alteration*. Thus a Man is generated, a Picture made, and either of them altered, when any new ſenſible Quality, or ſimple *Idea*, is produced in either of them, which was not there before; and the things thus made to exiſt, which were not there before, are *Effects*; and thoſe things, which operated to the Exiſtence, *Cauſes*. In which, and all other Caſes, we may obſerve, that the Notion of *Cauſe* and *Effect*, has its Riſe from *Ideas*, received by Senſation or Reflection; and that this Relation, how comprehenſive ſoever, terminates at laſt in them. For to have the *Idea* of *Cauſe* and *Effect*, it ſuffices to conſider any ſimple *Idea*, or Subſtance, as beginning to exiſt, by the Operation of ſome other, without knowing the manner of that Operation.

§. 3. *Time* and *Place* are alſo the Foundations of very large Relations, and all finite Beings at leaſt are concerned in them. But having already ſhewn in another Place, how we get theſe *Ideas*, it may ſuffice here to intimate, *Relations of Times.*

intimate, that most of the Denominations of things, received from time, are only Relations: Thus, when any one says, that Queen *Elizabeth* lived sixty nine, and reigned forty five Years, these Words import only the Relation of that Duration to some other, and means no more but this, That the Duration of her Existence was equal to sixty nine, and the Duration of her Government to forty five Annual Revolutions of the Sun; and so are all Words, answering, *how long*. Again, *William* the Conqueror invaded *England* about the Year 1070. which means this; That taking the Duration from our Saviour's Time, till now, for one entire great Length of Time, it shews at what Distance this Invasion was from the two Extreams: And so do all Words of Time, answering to the Question *When*, which shew only the Distance of any Point of Time, from the Period of a longer Duration, from which we measure, and to which we thereby consider it, as related.

§. 4. There are yet, besides those, other Words of Time, that ordinarily are thought to stand for positive *Ideas*, which yet will, when considered, be found to be relative, such as are *Young*, *Old*, &c. which include and intimate the Relation any thing has to a certain Length of Duration, whereof we have the *Idea* in our Minds. Thus having settled in our Thoughts the *Idea* of the ordinary Duration of a Man to be seventy Years, when we say a Man is *Young*, we mean, that his Age is yet but a small part of that which usually Men attain to: And when we denominate him *Old*, we mean, that his Duration is run out almost to the end of that which Men do not usually exceed. And so 'tis but comparing the particular Age, or Duration of this or that Man, to the *Idea* of that Duration which we have in our Minds, as ordinarily belonging to that sort of Animals: Which is plain, in the Application of these Names to other things; for a Man is called Young at twenty Years, and very young at seven Years old: But yet a Horse we call old at twenty, and a Dog at seven Years; because in each of these, we compare their Age to different *Ideas* of Duration, which are settled in our Mind, as belonging to these several sorts of Animals, in the ordinary Course of Nature. But the Sun and Stars, though they have out-lasted several Generations of Men, we call not old, because we do not know what Period GOD hath set to that sort of Beings. This Term belonging properly to those Things, which we can observe in the ordinary Course of Things, by a natural Decay, to come to an End in a certain Period of Time; and so have in our Minds, as it were, a Standard,

dard, to which we can compare the several Parts of their Duration; and by the Relation they bear thereunto, call them Young, or Old; which we cannot therefore do to a Ruby, or a Diamond, things whose usual Periods we know not.

§. 5. The *Relation* also that things have to one another, in their *Places* and Distances, is very obvious to observe; as Above, Below, a Mile distant from *Charing-Cross*, in *England*, and in *London*. But as in Duration, so in *Extension* and Bulk, there are some *Ideas* that are relative, which we signify by Names that are thought positive; as *Great and Little, are* truly *Relations*. For here also having, by Observation, settled in our Mind the *Ideas* of the Bigness of several Species of Things, from those we have been most accustomed to, we make them, as it were, the Standards whereby to denominate the Bulk of others. Thus we call a great Apple, such a one as is bigger than the ordinary sort of those we have been used to; and a little Horse, such a one as comes not up to the size of that *Idea*, which we have in our Minds, to belong ordinarily to Horses; And that will be a great Horse to a *Welsh*-man, which is but a little one to a *Fleming*; they two having, from the different Breed of their Countries, taken several siz'd *Ideas* to which they compare, and in Relation to which they denominate their Great, and their Little.

*Relations of Place and Extension.*

§. 6. So likewise *Weak and Strong, are* but *relative Denominations* of Power, compared to some *Ideas* we have, at that time, of greater or less Power. Thus when we say a Weak Man, we mean one that has not so much Strength or Power to move, as usually Men have, or usually those of his size have; which is a comparing his Strength to the *Idea* we have of the usual Strength of Men, or Men of such a size. The like when we say the Creatures are all weak Things; Weak, there, is but a relative Term, signifying the Disproportion there is in the Power of G O D, and the Creatures. And so abundance of Words, in ordinary Speech, stand only for Relations, (and, perhaps, the greatest part,) which at first sight, seem to have no such Signification: *v. g.* The Ship as necessary Stores. *Necessary* and *Stores*, are both relative Words; one having a Relation to the accomplishing the Voyage intended, and the other to future Use. All which Relations, how they are confined to, and terminate in *Ideas* derived from *Sensation* or *Reflection*, is too obvious to need any Explication.

*Absolute Terms often stand for Relations.*

# CHAP. XXVII.

## *Of Identity and Diverſity.*

*Wherein Identity conſiſts.*

§. 1. ANother Occaſion the Mind often takes of comparing, is, the very Being of Things, when conſidering any thing as exiſting at any determin'd time and place, we compare it with it ſelf exiſting at another time, and thereon from the *Ideas* of *Identity* and *Diverſity*. When we ſee any thing to be in any place in any Inſtant of Time, we are ſure, (be it what it will) that it is that very thing, and not another, which at that ſame time exiſts in another place, how like and undiſtinguiſhable ſoever it may be in all other Reſpects: And in this conſiſts *Identity*, when the *Ideas* it is attributed to, vary not at all from what they were that Moment, wherein we conſider their former Exiſtence, and to which we compare the preſent. For we never finding, nor conceiving it poſſible, that two things of the ſame kind ſhould exiſt in the ſame place at the ſame time, we rightly conclude, that whatever exiſts any where at any time, excludes all of the ſame kind, and is there it ſelf alone. When therefore we demand, whether any thing be the ſame or no? It refers always to ſomething that exiſted ſuch a time in ſuch a place, which 'twas certain, at that Inſtant, was the ſame with it ſelf, and no other: From whence it follows, that one thing cannot have two Beginnings of Exiſtence, nor two things one Beginning, it being impoſſible for two things of the ſame kind to be or exiſt in the ſame Inſtant, in the very ſame place, or one and the ſame thing in different places. That therefore that had one Beginning, is the ſame thing, and that which had a different Beginning in time and place from that, is not the ſame, but divers. That which has made the Difficulty about this Relation, has been the little Care and Attention uſed in having preciſe Notions of the things to which it is attributed.

*Identity of Subſtances.*

§. 2. We have the *Ideas* but of three ſorts of Subſtances; 1. God. 2. Finite Intelligences. 3. *Bodies*. Firſt, God is without Beginning, eternal, unalterable, and every where; and therefore concerning his Identity, there can be no doubt. Secondly, Finite

nite Spirits having had each its determinate time and place of Beginning to exist, the Relation to that time and place will always determine to each of them its Identity, as long as it exists. Thirdly, The same will hold of every Particle of Matter, to which no Addition or Substraction of Matter being made, it is the same. For though these three sorts of Substances, as we term them, do not exclude one another out of the same place; yet we cannot conceive but that they must necessarily each of them exclude any of the same kind out of the same place: Or else the Notions and Names of Identity and Diversity would be in vain, and there could be no such Distinction of Substances, or any thing else one from another. For Example; Could two Bodies be in the same place at the same time; then those two Parcels of Matter must be one and the same, take them great or little; nay, all Bodies must be one and the same. For by the same Reason that two Particles of Matter may be in one place, all Bodies may be in one place: Which, when it can be supposed, takes away the Distinction of Identity and Diversity of one and more, and renders it ridiculous. But it being a Contradiction, that two or more should be one, Identity and Diversity are Relations and Ways of comparing well founded, and of Use to the Understanding. All other things being but Modes or Relations ultimately terminated in Substances, the Identity and Diversity of each particular Existence of them too will be by the same Way determined: Only as to things whose Existence is in Succession, such as are the Actions of finite Beings, *v. g. Motion* and *Thought*, both which consist in a continued Train of Succession, concerning their Diversity, there can be no Question: Because each perishing the Moment it begins, they cannot exist in different times, or in different places, as permanent Beings can at different times exist in distant places; and therefore no Motion or Thought, considered as at different times, can be the same, each part thereof having a different Beginning of Existence.

*Identity of Modes.*

§. 3. From what has been said, 'tis easy to discover what is so much enquired after, the *principium Individuationis*, and that 'tis plain is Existence it self, which determines a Being of any sort to a particular time and place incommunicable to two Beings of the same kind. This, though it seems easier to conceive in simple Substances or Modes, yet when reflected on, is not more difficult in compounded ones, if Care be taken to what it is applied;

*Principium Individuationis.*

plied; *v. g.* Let us ſuppoſe an Atom, *i. e.* a continued Body under one immutable Superficies, exiſting in a determined time and place; 'tis evident, that, conſidered in any Inſtant of its Exiſtence, it is, in that Inſtant, the ſame with it ſelf. For being at that Inſtant what it is, and nothing elſe, it is the ſame, and ſo muſt continue as long as its Exiſtence is continued; for ſo long it will be the ſame, and no other. In like Manner, if two or more Atoms be joined together into the ſame Maſs, every one of thoſe Atoms will be the ſame, by the foregoing Rule: And whilſt they exiſt united together, the Maſs, conſiſting of the ſame Atoms, muſt be the ſame Maſs, or the ſame Body, let the Parts be never ſo differently jumbled: But if one of theſe Atoms be taken away, or one new one added, it is no longer the ſame Maſs, or the ſame Body. In the State of living Creatures, their Identity depends not on a Maſs of the ſame Particles, but on ſomething elſe. For in them the Variation of great Parcels of Matter alters not the Identity: An Oak growing from a Plant to a great Tree, and then lopp'd, is ſtill the ſame Oak: And a Colt grown up to a Horſe, ſometimes fat, ſometimes lean, is all the while the ſame Horſe; though, in both theſe Caſes, there may be a manifeſt Change of the Parts: So that truly they are not either of them the ſame Maſſes of Matter, though they be truly one of them the ſame Oak, and the other the ſame Horſe. The Reaſon whereof is, that in theſe two Caſes of a Maſs of Matter, and a living Body, *Identity* is not applied to the ſame thing.

*Identity of Vegetables.*

§. 4. We muſt therefore conſider wherein an Oak differs from a Maſs of Matter, and that ſeems to me to be in this; that the one is only the Coheſion of Particles of Matter any how united, the other ſuch a Diſpoſition of them as conſtitutes the Parts of an Oak; and ſuch an Organization of thoſe Parts, as is fit to receive, and diſtribute Nouriſhment, ſo as to continue, and frame the Wood, Bark, and Leaves, *&c.* of an Oak, in which conſiſts the vegetable Life. That being then one Plant, which has ſuch an Organization of Parts in one coherent Body, partaking of one common Life, it continues to be the ſame Plant, as long as it partakes of the ſame Life, though that Life be communicated to new Particles of Matter vitally united to the living Plant, in a like continued Organization, conformable to that ſort of Plants. For this Organization being at any one Inſtant in any one Collection of *Matter*, is in that particular Concrete diſtinguiſhed from all other, and is that individual Life, which exiſting

ing constantly from that Moment both forwards and backwards, in the same Continuity of insensibly succeeding Parts united to the living Body of the Plant, it has that Identity, which makes the same Plant, and all the Parts of it, Parts of the same Plant, during all the time that they exist united in that continued Organization, which is fit to convey that common Life to all the Parts so united.

*Identity of Animals.*

§. 5. The Case is not so much different in *Brutes*, but that any one may hence see what makes an Animal, and continues it the same. Something we have like this in Machines, and may serve to illustrate it. For Example, what is a Watch? 'Tis plain 'tis nothing but a fit Organization, or Construction of Parts, to a certain End, which, when a sufficient Force is added to it, it is capable to attain. If we would suppose this Machine one continued Body, all whose organized Parts were repair'd, increas'd or diminish'd, by a constant Addition or Separation of insensible Parts, with one common Life, we should have something very much like the Body of an Animal, with this Difference, That in an Animal the Fitness of the Organization, and the Motion wherein Life consists, begin together, the Motion coming from within; but in Machines, the Force coming sensibly from without, is often away when the Organ is in Order, and well fitted to receive it.

*Identity of Man.*

§. 6. This also shews wherein the Identity of the same *Man* consists; *viz.* in nothing but a Participation of the same continued Life, by constantly fleeting Particles of Matter, in Succession vitally united to the same organized Body. He that shall place the *Identity* of Man in any thing else, but like that of other Animals in one fitly organized Body, taken in any one Instant, and from thence continued under one Organization of Life in several successive fleeting Particles of Matter, united to it, will find it hard to make an *Embryo*, one of Years, mad, and sober, the same Man, by any Supposition, that will not make it possible for *Seth*, *Ismael*, *Socrates*, *Pilate*, St. *Austin*, and *Cæsar Borgia*, to be the same Man. For if the *Identity* of Soul alone makes the same Man, and there be nothing in the Nature of Matter, why the same individual Spirit may not be united to different Bodies, it will be possible, that those Men living in distant Ages, and of different Tempers, may have been the same Man: Which Way of speaking must be, from a very strange Use of the Word *Man*, applied to an *Idea*, out of which Body and Shape is excluded: And

that

that Way of speaking would agree yet worse with the Notions of those Philosophers, who allow of Transmigration, and are of Opinion that the Souls of Men may, for their Miscarriages, be detruded into the Bodies of Beasts, as fit Habitations, with Organs suited to the Satisfaction of their Brutal Inclinations. But yet, I think, no Body, could he be sure that the Soul of *Heliogabalus* were in one of his Hogs, would yet say that Hog were a *Man* or *Heliogabalus*.

*Identity suited to the Idea.*

§. 7. 'Tis not therefore Unity of Substance that comprehends all sorts of *Identity*, or will determine it in every Case: But to conceive, and judge of it aright, we must consider what *Idea* the Word it is applied to, stands for: It being one thing to be the same *Substance*, another the same *Man*, and a third the same *Person*, if *Person*, *Man*, and *Substance*, are three Names standing for three different *Ideas*; for such as is the *Idea* belonging to that Name, such must be the *Identity*: Which, if it had been a little more carefully attended to, would possibly have prevented a great deal of that Confusion, which often occurs about this Matter, with no small seeming Difficulties, especially concerning *Personal Identity*, which therefore we shall in the next place a little consider.

*Same Man.*

§. 8. An Animal is a living organized Body; and consequently, the same Animal, as we have observed, is the same continued Life communicated to different Particles of Matter, as they happen successively to be united to that organiz'd living Body. And whatever is talked of other Definitions, ingenuous Observation puts it past doubt, that the *Idea* in our Minds, of which the Sound *Man* in our Mouths is the Sign, is nothing else but of an Animal of such a certain Form: Since I think I may be confident, that whoever should see a Creature of his own Shape and Make, though it had no more Reason as its Life, than a *Cat* or a *Parrot*, would call him still a *Man*; or whoever should hear a *Cat* or a *Parrot* discourse, reason, and philosophize, would call or think it nothing but a *Cat* or a *Parrot*; and say, the one was a dull irrational *Man*, and the other a very intelligent rational *Parrot*. A Relation we have in an Author of great Note, is sufficient to countenance the Supposition of a rational *Parrot*. His Words * are,

* *Memoires of what past'd in* Christendom, *from* 1672 *to* 1679. p. $3\frac{17}{32}$.

'I had a Mind to know from Prince *Maurice*'s own Mouth, 'the Account of a common, but much credited Story, that I

'had

'had heard so often from many others of an old *Parrot* he had 'in *Brasil*, during his Government there, that spoke, and asked, 'and answered common Questions like a reasonable Creature; 'so that those of his Train there, generally concluded it to be 'Witchery or Possession; and one of his Chaplains, who lived 'long afterwards in *Holland*, would never from that time en-'dure a *Parrot*, but said, they all had a Devil in them. I had 'heard many Particulars of this Story, and assevered by People 'hard to be discredited, which made me ask Prince *Maurice* 'what there was of it. He said, with his usual Plainness and 'Dryness in Talk, there was something true, but a great deal 'false of what had been reported. I desired to know of him, 'what there was of the first? He told me short and coldly, 'that he had heard of such an old *Parrot* when he came to '*Brasil*; and though he believed nothing of it, and 'twas a good 'Way off, yet he had so much Curiosity as to send for it, that 'twas a very great and a very old one; and when it came first 'into the Room where the Prince was, with a great many '*Dutch-men* about him, it said presently, *What a Company of 'white Men are here?* They asked it what he thought that Man 'was, pointing at the Prince? It answered, *Some General or o-'ther*; when they brought it close to him, 'he asked it, *D'où venez-vous?* It answered, '*De Marinnan.* The Prince, *A qui estes-vous?* 'The Parrot, *A un Portugais.* Prince, *Que fais-tu là?* Parrot, *Je garde les Poules.* The 'Prince laughed, and said, *Vous gardez les 'Poules?* The Parrot answered, *Ouy, moy, & je scay bien faire*; and made the Chuck four 'or five times that People use to make to 'Chickens, when they call them. I set down 'the Words of this worthy Dialogue in *French*, 'just as Prince *Maurice* said them to me. I 'asked him in what Language the *Parrot* 'spoke, and he said, in *Brasilian*; I asked 'whether he understood *Brasilian?* he said, No: 'but he had taken Care to have two Inter-'preters by him, the one a *Dutch-man* that 'spoke *Brasilian*, and the other a *Brasilian*, 'that spoke *Dutch*; that he asked them separately and private-'ly, and both of them agreed in telling him just the same thing 'that the *Parrot* said. I could not but tell this odd Story, be-'cause it is so much out of the Way, and from the first Hand;

*Whence come ye? It answered, From* Marinnan. *The* Prince, *To whom do you belong? The* Parrot, *To a* Portugueze. Prince, *What do you there?* Parrot, *I look after the Chickens. The* Prince laughed, and said, *You look after the Chickens? The* Parrot answered, *Yes I, and I know well enough how to do it.*

'and

'and what may paſs for a good one; for I dare ſay this Prince 'at leaſt, believed himſelf in all he told me, having ever paſſed 'for a very honeſt and pious Man; I leave it to Naturaliſts to 'reaſon, and to other Men to believe as they pleaſe upon it; 'however, it is not perhaps amiſs to relieve or enliven a buſie 'Scene ſometimes with ſuch Digreſſions, whether to the Pur-'poſe or no.

I have taken Care that the Reader ſhould have the Story at large in the Author's own Words, becauſe he ſeems to me not to have thought it incredible; for it cannot be imaagined that ſo able a Man as he, who had Sufficiency enough to warrant all the Teſtimonies he gives of himſelf, ſhould take ſo much Pains, in a place where it had nothing to do, to pin ſo cloſe not only on a Man whom he mentions as his Friend, but on a Prince, in whom he acknowledges very great Honeſty and Piety; a Story, which if he himſelf thought incredible, he could not but alſo think ridiculous. The Prince, 'tis plain, who vouches this Story, and our Author, who relates it from him, both of them call this Talker a *Parrot*; and I ask any one elſe, who thinks ſuch a Story fit to be told, whether if this *Parrot*, and all of its kind, had always talked, as we have a Prince's Word for it, as this one did; whether, I ſay, they would not have paſſed for a Race of *rational Animals*; but yet whether for all that, they would have been allowed to be Men, and not *Parrots*? For I preſume 'tis not the *Idea* of a thinking or rational Being alone, that makes the *Idea* of a *Man* in moſt Peoples Senſe, but of a Body, ſo and ſo ſhaped, joined to it; and if that he the *Idea* of a *Man*, the ſame ſucceſſive Body not ſhifted all at once, muſt, as well as the ſame immaterial Spirit, go to the making of the ſame *Man*.

*Same Man.*

§. 9. This being premiſed to find wherein *perſonal Identity* conſiſts, we muſt conſider what *Perſon* ſtands for; which, I think, is a thinking intelligent Being, that has Reaſon and Reflection, and can conſider it ſelf as it ſelf, the ſame thinking thing in different times and places; which it does only by that Conſciouſneſs, which is inſeparable from thinking, and it ſeems to me eſſential to it: I being impoſſible for any one to perceive, without perceiving that he does perceive. When we ſee, hear, ſmell, taſte, feel, meditate, or will any thing, we know that we do ſo. Thus it is always as to our preſent Senſations and Perceptions: And by this every one is to himſelf that which he calls *Self*; it not being conſidered in this Caſe, whether the ſame

*Perſonal Identity.*

same *Self* be continued in the same, or divers Substances. For since Consciousness always accompanies thinking, and 'tis that that makes every one to be what he calls *Self*; and thereby distinguishes himself from all other thinking things; in this alone consists *personal Identity*, *i. e.* the Sameness of a rational Being: And as far as this Consciousness can be extended backwards to any past Action or Thought, so far reaches the Identity of that *Person*; it is the same *Self* now it was then; and 'tis by the same *Self* with this present one that now reflects on it, that that Action was done.

*Consciousness makes personal Identity.*

§. 10. But it is farther enquir'd, whether it be the same Identical Substance? This, few would think they had Reason to doubt of, if these Perceptions, with their Consciousness, always remain'd present in the Mind, whereby the same thinking thing would be always consciously present, and, as would be thought, evidently the same to it self. But that which seems to make the Difficulty, is this, that this Consciousness being interrupted always by Forgetfulness, there being no Moment of our Lives wherein we have the whole Train of all our past Actions before our Eyes in one View: But even the best Memories losing the Sight of one part whilst they are viewing another; and we sometimes, and that the greatest part of our Lives, not reflecting on our past Selves, being intent on our present Thoughts, and in sound Sleep, having no Thoughts at all, or, at least, none with that Consciousness which remarks our waking Thoughts. I say, in all these Cases, our Consciousness being interrupted, and we losing the Sight of our past *Selves*, Doubts are raised whether we are the same thinking thing, *i. e.* the same Substance, or no. Which, however reasonable, or unreasonable, concerns no *personal Identity* at all. The Question being, what makes the same *Person*, and not whether it be the same Identical Substance, which always thinks in the same Person, which in this Case matters not at all? Different Substances, by the same Consciousness, (where they do partake in it) being united into one Person, as well as different Bodies, by the same Life are united into one Animal, whose *Identity* is preserved, in that Change of Substances, by the Unity of one continued Life. For it being the same Consciousness that makes a Man be himself to himself, *personal Identity* depends on that only, whether it be annexed only to one individual Substance, or can be continued in a Succession of several Substances. For as far as any intelligent Being can repeat the *Idea* of any past Action with the same Consciousness it had

of

of it at first, and with the same Consciousness it has of any present Action; so far it is the same *personal Self*. For it is by the Consciousness it has of its present Thoughts and Actions, that it is *Self* to it *Self* now, and so will be the same *Self*, as far as the same Consciousness can extend to Actions past or to come; and would be by Distance of Time, or Change of Substance, no more two *Persons*, than a Man be two Men, by wearing other Cloaths to Day than he did Yesterday, with a long or short Sleep between: The same Consciousness uniting those distant Actions into the same *Person*, whatever Substances contributed to their Production.

*Personal Identity in Change of Substances.*

§. 11. That this is so, we have some kind of Evidence in our very Bodies, all whose Particles, whilst vitally united to this same thinking conscious Self, so that we feel when they are touch'd, and are affected by, and conscious of Good or Harm that happens to them, are a part of our *Selves*; *i. e.* of our thinking conscious *Self*. Thus the Limbs of his Body is to every one a part of *himself*: He sympathizes and is concerned for them. Cut off an Hand, and thereby separate it from that Consciousness we had of its Heat, Cold, and other Affections, and it is then no longer a part of that which is *himself*, any more than the remotest part of Matter. Thus we see the *Substance*, whereof *personal Self* consisted at one time, may be varied at another, without the Change of personal *Identity*; there being no Question about the same Person, though the Limbs, which but now were a part of it, be cut off.

§. 12. But the Question is, whether if the same Substance, which thinks, be changed, it can be the same Person, or remaining the same, it can be different Persons.

*Whether in the Change of thinking Substances.*

And to this I answer, first, This can be no Question at all to those, who place Thought in a purely material, animal Constitution, void of an immaterial Substance. For, whether their Supposition be true or no, 'tis plain they conceive personal Identity preserved in something else than Identity of Substance; as animal Identity is preserved in Identity of Life, and not of Substance. And therefore those, who place thinking in an immaterial Substance only, before they can come to deal with these Men, must shew why personal Identity cannot be preserved in the Change of immaterial Substances, or Variety of particular immaterial Substances, as well as animal Identity is preserved in the Change of material Substances, or

Variety

Variety of particular Bodies: Unleſs they will ſay, 'tis one immaterial Spirit that makes the ſame Life in Brutes, as it is one immaterial Spirit that makes the ſame Perſon in Men, which the *Carteſians* at leaſt will not admit, for Fear of making Brutes thinking Things too.

§. 13. But next, as to the firſt part of the Queſtion, Whether if the ſame thinking Subſtance (ſuppoſing immaterial Subſtances only to think) be changed, it can be the ſame Perſon? I anſwer, That cannot be reſolv'd, but by thoſe who know what kind of Subſtances they are that do think; and whether the Conſciouſneſs of paſt Actions can be transferr'd from one thinking Subſtance to another. I grant, were the ſame Conſciouſneſs the ſame individual Action, it could not: But it being but a preſent Repreſentation of a paſt Action, why it may not be poſſible, that that may be repreſented to the Mind to have been, which really never was, will remain to be ſhewn. And therefore how far the Conſciouſneſs of paſt Actions is annexed to any individual Agent, ſo that another cannot poſſibly have it, will be hard for us to determine, till we know what kind of Action it is; that cannot be done without a reflex Act of Perception accompanying it, and how perform'd by thinking Subſtances, who cannot think without being conſcious of it. But that which we call the *ſame Conſciouſneſs*, not being the ſame individual Act, why one intellectual Subſtance may not have repreſented to it, as done by it ſelf, what it never did, and was perhaps done by ſome other Agent; why, I ſay, ſuch a Repreſentation may not poſſibly be without Reality of Matter of Fact, as well as ſeveral Repreſentations in Dreams are, which yet, whilſt dreaming, we take for true, will be difficult to conclude from the Nature of Things. And that it never is ſo, will by us, till we have clearer Views of the Nature of thinking Subſtances, be beſt reſolv'd into the Goodneſs of God, who, as far as the Happineſs or Miſery of any of his ſenſible Creatures is concerned in it, will not by a fatal Error of theirs transfer from one to another that Conſciouſneſs which draws Reward or Puniſhment with it. How far this may be an Argument againſt thoſe who would place Thinking in a Syſtem of fleeting animal Spirits, I leave to be conſidered. But yet to return to the Queſtion before us, it muſt be allowed, That if the ſame Conſciouſneſs (which, as has been ſhewn, is quite a different thing from the ſame numerical Figure or Motion in Body) can be transferr'd from one thinking Subſtance to another, it will be poſſible, that two thinking Subſtances may make but one Perſon.

For the ſame Conſciouſneſs being preſerv'd, whether in the ſame or different Subſtances, the perſonal Identity is preſerv'd?

§. 14. As to the ſecond part of the Queſtion, Whether the ſame immaterial Subſtance remaining, there may be two diſtinct Perſons? Which Queſtions ſeems to me to be built on this, Whether the ſame immaterial Being, being conſcious of the Actions of its paſt Duration, may be wholly ſtripp'd of all the Conſciouſneſs of its paſt Exiſtence, and loſe it beyond the Power of ever retrieving again: And ſo as it were beginning a new Account from a new Period, have a Conſciouſneſs that cannot reach beyond this new State. All thoſe who hold Pre-exiſtence, are evidently of this Mind, ſince they allow the Soul to have no remaining Conſciouſneſs of what it did in that pre-exiſtent State, either wholly ſeparate from Body, or informing any other Body; and if they ſhould not, 'tis plain, Experience would be againſt them. So that perſonal Identity reaching no farther than Conſciouſneſs reaches, a pre-exiſtent Spirit not having continued ſo many Ages in a State of Silence, muſt needs make different Perſons. Suppoſe a *Chriſtian Platoniſt* or *Pythagorean*, ſhould, upon God's having ended all his Works of Creation the Seventh Day, think his Soul hath exiſted ever ſince; and ſhould imagine it has revolved in ſeveral Human Bodies, as I once met with one, who was perſwaded his had been the Soul of *Socrates*, (how reaſonably I will not diſpute. This I know, that in the Poſt he fill'd, which was no inconſiderable one, he paſſed for a very rational Man; and the Preſs has ſhewn that he wanted not Parts or Learning) would any one ſay, that he being not conſcious of any of *Socrates*'s Actions or Thoughts, could be the ſame Perſon with *Socrates*? Let any one reflect upon himſelf, and conclude, that he has in himſelf an immaterial Spirit, which is that which thinks in him, and in the conſtant Change of his Body keeps him the ſame; and is that which he calls himſelf: Let him alſo ſuppoſe it to be the ſame Soul that was in *Neſtor* or *Therſites*, at the Siege of *Troy*, (for Souls being, as far as we know any thing of them in their Nature, indifferent to any Parcel of Matter, the Suppoſition has no apparent Abſurdity in it) which it may have been, as well as it is now, the Soul of any other Man: But he now having no Conſciouſneſs of any of the Actions either of *Neſtor* or *Therſites*, does, or can he, conceive himſelf the ſame Perſon with either of them? Can he be concerned in either of their Actions? Attribute them to himſelf, or think them his own more than the Actions of any other Man that ever exiſted? So that this Conſciouſneſs

not

not reaching to any of the Actions of either of those Men, he is no more one *Self* with either of them, than if the Soul or immaterial Spirit that now informs him, had been created, and began to exist, when it began to inform his present Body, though it were never so true, that the same Spirit that informed *Nestor*'s or *Therstes*'s Body, were numerically the same that now informs his. For this would no more make him the same Person with *Nestor*, than if some of the Particles of Matter that were once a part of *Nestor*, were now a part of this Man; the same immaterial Substance, without the same Consciousness, no more making the same Person by being united to any Body, than the same Particle of Matter, without Consciousness united to any Body, makes the same Person. But let him once find himself conscious of any of the Actions of *Nestor*, he then finds himself the same Person with *Nestor*.

§. 15. And thus we may be able, without any Difficulty, to conceive the same Person at the Resurrection, though in a Body not exactly in Make or Parts the same which he had here, the same Consciousness going along with the Soul that inhabits it. But yet the Soul alone, in the Change of Bodies, would scarce to any one, but to him that makes the Soul the *Man*, be enough to make the same *Man*. For should the Soul of a Prince, carrying with it the Consciousness of the Prince's past Life, enter and inform the Body of a Cobler, as soon as deserted by his own Soul, every one sees he would be the same Person with the Prince, accountable only for the Prince's Actions: But who would say it was the same Man? The Body too goes to the making the Man, and would, I guess, to every Body, determine the Man in this Case, wherein the Soul, with all its Princely Thoughts about it, would not make another Man: But he would be the same Cobler to every one besides himself. I know that in the ordinary Way of speaking, the same Person, and the same Man, stand for one and the same thing. And, indeed, every one will always have a Liberty to speak as he pleases, and to apply what articulate Sounds to what *Ideas* he thinks fit, and change them as often as he pleases. But yet when we will enquire what makes the same *Spirit*, *Man*, or *Person*, we must fix the *Ideas* of *Spirit*, *Man*, or *Person* in our Mind; and having resolved with our selves what we mean by them, it will not be hard to determine in either of them, or the like, when it is the *same*, and when not.

§. 16. But though the same immaterial Substance or Soul, does not alone, where-ever it *Consciousness makes the same Person.*

be, and in whatſoever State, make the ſame Man; yet 'tis plain Conſciouſneſs, as far as ever it can be extended, ſhould it be to Ages paſt, unites Exiſtences and Actions, very remote in time, into the ſame Perſon, as well as it does the Exiſtence and Actions of the immediately preceding Moment: So that whatever has the Conſciouſneſs of preſent and paſt Actions, is the ſame Perſon to whom they both belong. Had I the ſame Conſciouſneſs, that I ſaw the Ark and *Noah's* Flood, as that I ſaw an overflowing of the *Thames* laſt Winter, or as that I write now, I could no more doubt that I that write this now, that ſaw the *Thames* overflow'd laſt Winter, and that view'd the Flood at the general Deluge, was the ſame *Self*, place that *Self* in what Subſtance you pleaſe, than that I that write this am the ſame *my ſelf* now whilſt I write (whether I conſiſt of all the ſame Subſtance, material or immaterial, or no) that I was Yeſterday. For as to this Point of being the ſame *Self*, it matters not whether this preſent *Self* be made up of the ſame or other Subſtances, I being as much concern'd, and as juſtly accountable for any Action was done a thouſand Years ſince, appropriated to me now by this Self-conſciouſneſs, as I am for what I did the laſt Moment.

*Self depends on Conſciouſneſs.*

§. 17. *Self* is that conſcious thinking thing, (whatever Subſtance, made up of whether ſpiritual, or material, ſimple, or compounded, it matters not) which is ſenſible, or conſcious of Pleaſure and Pain, capable of Happineſs or Miſery, and ſo is concern'd for it *ſelf*, as far as that Conſciouſneſs extends. Thus every one finds, that whilſt comprehended under that Conſciouſneſs, the little Finger is as much a part of it *ſelf*, as what is moſt ſo. Upon Separation of this little Finger, ſhould this Conſciouſneſs go along with the little Finger, and leave the reſt of the Body, 'tis evident the little Finger would be the *Perſon*, the *ſame Perſon*; and Self then would have nothing to do with the reſt of the Body. As in this Caſe, it is the Conſciouſneſs that goes along with the Subſtance, when one part is ſeparate from another, which makes the ſame *Perſon*, and conſtitutes this inſeparable *Self*; ſo it is in Reference to Subſtance remote in time. That with which the *Conſciouſneſs* of this preſent thinking thing can join it ſelf, makes the ſame *Perſon*, and is one *Self* with it, and with nothing elſe; and ſo attributes to it *ſelf*, and owns all the Actions of that thing as its own, as far as that Conſciouſneſs reaches, and no farther; as every one who reflects, will perceive.

§. 18.

§. 18. In this *personal Identity*, is founded all the Right and Justice of Reward and Punishment; Happiness and Misery being that for which every one is concerned for *himself*, not mattering what becomes of any Substance, not joined to, or affected with that Consciousness. For as it is evident in the Instance I gave but now, if the Consciousness went along with the little Finger, when it was cut off, that would be the same *Self* which was concerned for the whole Body Yesterday, as making a part of it *self*, whose Actions then it cannot but admit as its own now. Though if the same Body should still live, and immediately, from the Separation of the little Finger, have its own peculiar Consciousness, whereof the little Finger knew nothing, it would not at all be concerned for it, as a part of it *self*, or could own any of its Actions, or have any of them imputed to him. *Object of Reward and Punishments.*

§. 19. This may shew us wherein *personal Identity* consists, not in the Identity of Substance, but, as I have said, in the Identity of *Consciousness*, wherein, if *Socrates* and the present Mayor of *Quinborough* agree, they are the same Person: If the same *Socrates*, waking and sleeping do not partake of the same *Consciousness*, *Socrates* waking and sleeping, is not the same Person. And to punish *Socrates* waking, for what sleeping *Socrates* thought, and waking *Socrates* was never conscious of, would be no more of Right, than to punish one Twin for what his Brother-Twin did, whereof he knew nothing, because their Outsides were so like, that they could not be distinguished; for such Twins have been seen.

§. 20. But yet possibly it will still be objected, suppose I wholly lose the Memory of some Parts of my Life, beyond a Possibility of retrieving them, so that perhaps I shall never be conscious of them again; yet am I not the same Person that did those Actions, had those Thoughts, that I was once conscious of, though I have now forgot them? To which I answer, that we must here take Notice what the Word *I* is applied to; which, in this Case, is the Man only. And the same Man being presumed to be the same Person, *I* is easily here supposed to stand also for the same Person. But if it be possible for the same Man to have distinct incommunicable Consciousness at different times, it is past doubt the same Man would at different times make different Persons; which, we see, is the Sense of Mankind in the solemnest Declaration of their Opinions, Human Laws not punishing the *Mad-Man* for the *Sober-Man*'s Actions, nor the

*Sober-Man* for what the *Mad-Man* did, thereby making them two Persons; which is somewhat explained by our Way of speaking in *English*, when we say such an one *is not himself*, or is *besides himself*, in which Phrases it is insinuated, as if those who now, or, at least, first used them, thought that *Self* was changed, the *self* same Person was no longer in that Man.

*Difference between Identity of Man and Person.*

§. 21. But yet 'tis hard to conceive, that *Socrates*, the same individual Man, should be two Persons. To help us a little in this, we must consider what is meant by *Socrates*, or the same individual *Man*.

*First*, It must be either the same individual, immaterial, thinking Substance: In short, the same numerical Soul, and nothing else.

*Secondly*, Or the same Animal, without any Regard to an immaterial Soul.

*Thirdly*, Or the same immaterial Spirit united to the same Animal.

Now, take which of these Suppositions you please, it is impossible to make personal Identity to consist in any thing but Consciousness; or reach any farther than that does.

For by the First of them, it must be allowed possible, that a Man born of different Women, and in distant Times, may be the same Man. A Way of speaking, which, whoever admits, must allow it possible, for the same Man to be two distinct Persons, as any two that have lived in different Ages, without the Knowledge of one another's Thoughts.

By the Second and Third, *Socrates* in this Life, and after it, cannot be the same Man any way, but by the same Consciousness; and so making *human Identity* to consist in the same thing wherein we place *personal Identity*, there will be no Difficulty to allow the same Man to be the same Person. But then they who place *human Identity* in Consciousness only, and not in something else, must consider how they will make the Infant *Socrates* the same Man with *Socrates* after the Resurrection. But whatsoever to some Men makes a *Man*, and consequently the same individual Man, wherein perhaps few are agreed, personal Identity can by us be placed in nothing but Consciousness, (which is that alone which makes what we call *self*) without involving us in great Absurdities.

§. 22.

§. 22. But is not a Man drunk and ſober the ſame Perſon, why elſe is he puniſh'd for the Fact he commits when drunk, though he be never afterwards conſcious of it? Juſt as much the ſame Perſon, as a Man that walks, and does other things in his Sleep, is the ſame Perſon, and is anſwerable for any Miſchief he ſhall do in it. Human Laws puniſh both with a Juſtice ſuitable to their Way of Knowledge; becauſe in theſe Caſes, they cannot diſtinguiſh certainly what is real, what counterfeit; and ſo the Ignorance in Drunkenneſs or Sleep, is not admitted as a Plea. For though Puniſhment be annexed to Perſonality, and Perſonality to Conſciouſneſs, and the Drunkard perhaps be not conſcious of what he did; yet Human Judicatures juſtly puniſh him; becauſe the Fact is proved againſt him, but want of Conſciouſneſs cannot be proved for him. But in the great Day, wherein the Secrets of all Hearts ſhall be laid open, it may be reaſonable to think, no one ſhall be made to anſwer for what he knows nothing of; but ſhall receive his Doom, his Conſcience accuſing or excuſing him.

*Conſciouſneſs alone makes Self.*

§. 23. Nothing but Conſciouſneſs can unite remote Exiſtences into the ſame Perſon, the Identity of Subſtance will not do it. For whatever Subſtance there is, however framed, without Conſciouſneſs, there is no Perſon: And a Carcaſe may be a Perſon, as well as any ſort of Subſtance be ſo without Conſciouſneſs.

Could we ſuppoſe two diſtinct incommunicable Conſciouſneſſes acting the ſame Body, the one conſtantly by Day, the other by Night; and, on the other ſide, the ſame Conſciouſneſs, acting by Intervals, two diſtinct Bodies: I ask in the firſt Caſe, Whether the *Day* and the *Night-man* would not be two as diſtinct Perſons, as *Socrates* and *Plato*? And whether in the ſecond Caſe, there would not be one Perſon in two diſtinct Bodies, as much as one Man is the ſame in two diſtinct Clothings. Nor is it at all material to ſay, that this ſame, and this diſtinct *Conſciouſneſs*, in the Caſes above-mentioned, is owing to the ſame and diſtinct immaterial Subſtances, bringing it with them to thoſe Bodies, which, whether true or no, alters not the Caſe: Since 'tis evident the *perſonal Identity* would equally be determined by the Conſciouſneſs, whether that Conſciouſneſs were annexed to ſome individual immaterial Subſtance, or no. For granting, that the thinking Subſtance in Man muſt be neceſſarily ſuppos'd immaterial, 'tis evident, that immaterial thinking Thing may ſometimes part with its paſt Conſciouſneſs, and be reſtored to it again, as appears in Forgetfulneſs Men often have

of their past Actions, and the Mind many times recovers the Memory of a past Consciousness, which it had lost for twenty Years together. Make these Intervals of Memory and Forgetfulness to take their Turns regularly by Day and Night, and you have two Persons with the same immaterial Spirit, as much as in the former Instance, two Persons with the same Body. So that *Self* is not determined by Identity or Diversity of Substance, which it cannot be sure of, but only by Identity of Consciousness.

§. 24. Indeed it may conceive the Substance whereof it is now made up, to have existed formerly, united in the same conscious Being: But Consciousness removed, that Substance is no more it *self*, or makes no more a part of it, than any other Substance, as is evident in the Instance we have already given of a Limb cut off, of whose Heat, or Cold, or other Affections, having no longer any Consciousness, it is no more of a Man's self, than any other Matter of the Universe. In like Manner it will be in Reference to any immaterial Substance, which is void of that Consciousness whereby I am my *self* to my *self*: If there be any part of its Existence, which I cannot upon Recollection join with that present Consciousness whereby I am now my *self*, it is in that part of its Existence no more my *self*, than any other immaterial Being. For whatsoever any Substance has thought or done, which I cannot recollect, and by my Consciousness make my own Thought and Action, it will no more belong to me, whether a Part of me thought or did it, than if it had been thought or done by any other immaterial Being any where existing.

§. 25. I agree the more probable Opinion is, that this Consciousness is annexed to, and the Affection of one individual immaterial Substance.

But let Men, according to their divers Hypotheses, resolve of that as they please. This every intelligent Being, sensible of Happiness or Misery, must grant, that there is something that is *himself* that he is concerned for, and would have happy; that this *Self* has existed in a continued Duration more than one Instant, and therefore 'tis possible may exist, as it has done, Months and Years to come, without any certain Bounds to be set to its Duration; and may be the same *Self*, by the same Consciousness, continued on for the future. And thus, by this Consciousness, he finds himself to be the *same Self* which did such or such an Action some Years since, by which he comes to be happy or miserable now. In all which Account of *Self*, the

the ſame numerical Subſtance is not conſidered as making the ſame *Self*: But the ſame continued Conſciouſneſs, in which ſeveral Subſtances may have been united, and again ſeparated from it, which, whilſt they continued in a vital Union with that, wherein this Conſciouſneſs then reſided, made a Part of that ſame Self. Thus any Part of our Bodies vitally united to that which is conſcious in us, makes a Part of our *Selves*: But upon Separation from the vital Union, by which that Conſciouſneſs is communicated, that which a Moment ſince was part of our *Selves*, is now no more ſo, than a Part of another Man's *Self* is a Part of me; and 'tis not impoſſible, but in a little time may become a real Part of another Perſon. And ſo we have the ſame numerical Subſtance become a Part of two different Perſons; and the ſame Perſon preſerved under the Change of various Subſtances. Could we ſuppoſe any Spirit wholly ſtripp'd of all its Memory or Conſciouſneſs of paſt Actions, as we find our Minds always are of a great Part of ours, and ſometimes of them all, the Union or Separation of ſuch a ſpiritual Subſtance would make no Variation of perſonal Identity, any more than that of any Particle of Matter does. Any Subſtance vitally united to the preſent thinking Being, is a Part of that very *ſame Self* which now is: Any thing united to it by a Conſciouſneſs of former Actions, makes alſo a Part of the *ſame Self*, which is the ſame both then and now.

*Perſon, a Forenſick Term.*

§. 26. *Perſon*, as I take it, is the Name for this *Self*. Where-ever a Man finds what he calls *Himſelf*, there I think another may ſay is the *ſame Perſon*. It is a Forenſick Term appropriating Actions and their Merit; and ſo belongs only to intelligent Agents capable of a Law, and Happineſs and Miſery. This Perſonality extends it *ſelf* beyond preſent Exiſtence to what is paſt, only by Conſciouſneſs, whereby it becomes concerned and accountable, owns and imputes to it *ſelf* paſt Actions, juſt upon the ſame Ground, and for the ſame Reaſon that it does the preſent. All which is founded in a Concern for Happineſs, the unavoidable Concomitant of Conſciouſneſs, that which is conſcious of Pleaſure and Pains, deſiring that that Self that is conſcious, ſhould be happy. And therefore whatever paſt Actions it cannot reconcile, or appropriate to that preſent *Self* by Conſciouſneſs, it can be no more concerned in, than if they had never been done: And to receive Pleaſure or Pain, *i. e.* Reward or Puniſhment, on the Account of any ſuch Action, is all one, as to be made happy or miſerable in its firſt Being, without any Demerit at all.

all. For supposing a Man punish'd now for what he had done in another Life, whereof he could be made to have no Consciousness at all, what Difference is there between that Punishment, and being created miserable? And therefore conformable to this, the Apostle tells us, that at the Great Day, when every one shall *receive according to his Doings, the Secrets of all Hearts shall be laid open.* The Sentence shall be justified by the Consciousness all Persons shall have, that they *themselves*, in what Bodies soever they appear, or what Substances soever that Consciousness adheres to, are the *same* that committed those Actions, and deserve that Punishment for them.

§. 27. I am apt enough to think I have, in treating of this Subject, made some Suppositions that will look strange to some Readers, and possibly they are so in themselves. But yet, I think, they are such as are pardonable in this Ignorance we are in of the Nature of that thinking Thing that is in us, and which we look on as our *Selves.* Did we know what it was, or how it was tied to a certain System of fleeting Animal Spirits; or whether it could, or could not perform its Operations of Thinking and Memory out of a Body organized as ours is; and whether it has pleased God, that no one such Spirit shall ever be united to any but one such Body, upon the right Constitution of whose Organs its Memory should depend, we might see the Absurdity of some of those Suppositions I have made. But taking, as we ordinarily now do (in the Dark concerning these Matters) the Soul of a Man, for an immaterial Substance, independent from Matter, and indifferent alike to it all, there can from the Nature of Things be no Absurdity at all, to suppose, that the same Soul may, at different times, be united to different Bodies, and with them make up, for that time, one Man: As well as we suppose a Part of a Sheep's Body Yesterday, should be a Part of a Man's Body to Morrow, and in that Union make a vital Part of *Melibæus* himself, as well as it did of his Ram.

*The Difficulty from ill Use of Names.*

§. 28. To conclude, whatever Substance begins to exist, it must, during its Existence, necessarily be the same: Whatever Compositions of Substances begin to exist, during the Union of those Substances, the Concrete must be the same: Whatsoever Mode begins to exist, during its Existence, it is the same: And so if the Composition be of distinct Substances, and different Modes, the same Rule holds. Whereby it will appear, that the Difficulty or Obscurity that has been about this Matter, rather rises from the Names *ill* used, than from any Obscurity

security in Things themselves. For whatever makes the specifick *Idea*, to which the Name is applied, if that *Idea* be steadily kept to, the Distinction of any thing into the same, and divers will easily be conceived, and there can arise no Doubt about it.

*Continued Existence makes Identity.*

§. 29. For supposing a rational Spirit be the *Idea* of a *Man*, 'tis easie to know what is the *same Man*, *viz.* the *same Spirit*, whether separate or in a Body, will be the *same Man*. Supposing a rational Spirit vitally united to a Body of a certain Conformation of Parts to make a *Man*, whilst that rational Spirit, with that vital Conformation of Parts, though continued in a fleeting successive Body, remains, it will be the *same Man*. But if to any one the *Idea* of a *Man* be but the vital Union of Parts in a certain Shape; as long as that vital Union and Shape remains, in a Concrete no otherwise the same, but by a continued Succession of fleeting Particles, it will be the same *Man*. For whatever be the Composition, whereof the complex *Idea* is made, whenever Existence makes it one particular thing under any Denomination, the same Existence continued, preserves it the same individual under the same Denomination. *

CHAP.

---

* The Doctrine of Identity and Diversity, contained in this Chapter, the Bishop of *Worcester* pretends to be inconsistent with the Doctrine of the Christian Faith, concerning the Resurrection of the Dead. His Way of arguing from it, is this: He says, *The Reason of believing the Resurrection of the same Body upon Mr.* Locke's *Grounds, is from the* Idea *of Identity.* To which our Author † answers: Give me leave, my Lord, to say, that the *Reason of believing* any Article of the Christian Faith (such as your Lordship is here speaking of) to me, and *upon my Grounds*, is its being a part of Divine Revelation: Upon this Ground I believed it before I either writ that Chapter of *Identity and Diversity*, and before I ever thought of those Propositions which your Lordship quotes out of that Chapter, and upon the same Ground I believe it still; and not *from my* Idea *of Identity*. This Saying of your Lordship's therefore, being a Proposition neither self-evident, nor allowed by me to be true, remains to be proved. So that your Foundation failing all your large Superstructure built thereon, comes to nothing.

† *In his 3d Letter to the Bishop of* Worcester, p. 165, *&c.*

But, my Lord, before we go any farther, I crave leave humbly to represent to your Lordship, That I thought you undertook to *make out*, that my *Notion of Ideas* was *inconsistent with the Article of the Christian Faith.* But that which your Lordship instances in here, is not, that I yet know, an *Article of the Christian Faith.* The *Resurrection of the Death*, I acknowledge

ledge to be an Article of the Christian Faith: But that the *Resurrection of the same Body*, in your Lordship's Sense of *the same Body*, is an Article of the Christian Faith, is what, I confess, I do not yet know.

In the New Testament (wherein, I think, are contained all the *Articles of the Christian Faith*) I find our Saviour and the Apostles to preach *the Resurrection of the Dead*, and the *Resurrection from the Dead* in many Places: But I do not remember any Place, where the *Resurrection of the same Body* is so much as mentioned. Nay, which is very remarkable in the Case, I do not remember in any Place of the New Testament (where the general Resurrection at the last Day is spoken of) any such Expression as the *Resurrection of the Body*, much less *of the same Body*.

I say the general Resurrection at the last Day: Because where the Resurrection of some particular Persons presently upon our Saviour's Resurrection is mentioned, the Words are, * *The Graves were opened, and many Bodies of Saints, which slept, arose, and came out of the Graves after his Resurrection, and went into the Holy City, and appeared to many*: Of which peculiar Way of speaking of this Resurrection, the Passage it self gives a Reason in these Words, *appeared to many*; i. e. those *who slept, appeared*, so as to be known to be risen. But this could not be known, unless they brought with them the Evidence, that they were those who had been dead, whereof there were these two Proofs, their Graves were opened, and their Bodies not only gone out of them, but appeared to be the same to those who had known them formerly alive, and knew them to be dead and buried. For if they had been those who had been dead so long, that all who knew them once alive, were now gone, those to whom they appeared might have known them to be Men; but could not have known they were risen from the Dead, because they never knew they had been dead. All that by their appearing they could have known, was, that they were so many living Strangers, of whose Resurrection they knew nothing. 'Twas necessary therefore, that they should come in such Bodies, as might in Make and Size, *&c.* appear to be the same they had before, that they might be known to those of their Acquaintance, whom they appeared to. And it is probable they were such as were newly dead, whose Bodies were not yet dissolved and dissipated; and therefore 'tis particularly said here, (differently from what is said of the general Resurrection) that their *Bodies arose*; because they were the same that were then lying in their Graves, the Moment before they rose.

* Mat. 27. 52, 53.

But your Lordship endeavours to prove it must be the *same Body*: And let us grant, that your Lordship, nay, and others too, think you have proved it *must* be the same Body; will you therefore say, that he holds what is inconsistent with an Article of Faith, who having never seen this your Lordship's Interpretation of the Scripture, nor your Reasons for the *same Body*, in your Sense of *same Body*; or, if he has seen them, yet not understanding them, or not perceiving the Force of them, believes what the Scripture proposes to him, *viz.* That at the last Day, the *Dead shall be raised*, without determining whether it shall be with the very same Bodies or no?

I know

I know your Lordship pretends not to erect your particular Interpretations of Scripture, into Articles of Faith; and if you do not, he that believes the *Dead shall be raised*, believes that Article of Faith, which the Scripture proposes: And cannot be accused of holding any thing *inconsistent* with it, if it should happen, that what he holds is *inconsistent* with another Proposition, *viz. That the Dead shall be raised with the same Bodies*, in your Lordship's Sense, which I do not find proposed in Holy Writ as an Article of Faith.

But your Lordship argues, *it must be the same Body*; which, as you explain *same Body*, † *is not the same individual Particles of Matter, which were united at the Point of Death. Nor the same Particles of Matter, that the Sinner had at the time of the Commission of his Sins. But that it must be the same material Substance which was vitally united to the Soul here*; i. e. as I understand it, the same individual Particles of Matter, which were, some time or other during his Life here, vitally united to his Soul. † P. 34, 35.

Your first Argument to prove, that *it must be the same Body* in this Sense of the *same Body*, is taken * from these Words of our Saviour. *All that are in the Graves, shall hear his Voice, and shall come forth.* ‡ From whence your Lordship argues, That these Words, *all that are in their Graves, relate to no other Substance, than what was united to the Soul in Life*; because *a different Substance cannot be said to be in the Graves, and to come out of them.* Which Words of your Lordship's, if they prove any thing, prove, that the Soul too is lodg'd in the Grave, and raised out of it at the last Day. For your Lordship says, *Can a different Substance be said to be in their Graves, and come out of them?* So that according to this Interpretation of these Words of our Saviour; *No other Substance* being raised, but what hear his Voice; and *no other Substance* hearing this Voice, but what being called, comes out of the Grave; and *no other Substance* coming out of the Grave, but what was in the Grave, any one must conclude, that the Soul, unless it be in the Grave, will make no part of the Person that is raised, *unless*, as your Lordship argues against me, * *You can make it out, that a Substance which never was in the Grave, may come out of it*, or that the Soul is no *Substance*. * P. 37. ‡ John 5. 28, 29. * P. 37.

But setting aside the *Substance* of the Soul, another thing that will make any one doubt, whether this your Interpretation of our Saviour's Words be necessary to be received as their true Sense, is, That it will not be very easily reconciled to your saying, † you do not mean by the same Body, *The same individual Particles which were united at the Point of Death.* And yet by this Interpretation of our Saviour's Words, you can mean no other *Particles*, but such as were united at the Point of Death; because you mean no other *Substance*, but what *comes out of the Grave*; and no *Substance*, no Particle *come out*, you say, but what were *in the Grave*; and I think your Lordship will not say, that the Particles that were separate from the Body *by Perspiration*, before the Point of Death, were laid up in the Grave. † P. 34.

But

But your Lordship, I find, has an answer to this, * *viz. That by comparing this with other Places, you find that the Words,* [ of our Saviour above quoted ] *are to be understood of the Substance of the Body, to which the Soul was united, and not to* (I suppose your Lordship writ *of*) *those individual Particles,* i. e. *those individual Particles* that are in the Grave at the Resurrection. For so they must be read to make your Lordship's Sense entire, and to the Purpose of your Answer here: And then methinks this lost Sense of our Saviour's Words given by your Lordship, wholly overturns the Sense which you have given of them above, where from those Words you press the Belief of the Resurrection of the same Body, by this strong Argument, that a *Substance* could not, upon hearing the Voice of Christ, *come out of the Grave, which was never in the Grave.* There (as far as I can understand your Words) your Lordship argues that our Saviour's Words must be understood of the Particles in the Grave, *unless*, as your Lordship says, *one can make it out, that a Substance which never was in the Grave, may come out of it.* And here your Lordship expressly says, That our Saviour's *Words are to be understood of the Substance of that Body, to which the Soul was* [ at any time ] *united, and not to those individual Particles that are in the Grave.* Which put together, seems to me to say, That our Saviour's Words are to be understood of those Particles only that are in the Grave, and not of those Particles only which are in the Grave, but of others also, which have at any time been *vitally united to the Soul*, but never were in the Grave.

* P. 37.

The next Text your Lordship brings to make the *Resurrection of the same Body*, in your Sense, an Article of Faith, are these Words of St. *Paul*; † *For we must all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his Body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* To which your Lordship subjoins ‡ this Question: *Can these Words be understood of any other material Substance, but that Body in which these things were done? Answ.* A Man may suspend his determining the Meaning of the Apostle to be, that a Sinner shall suffer for his Sins in the very *same Body* wherein he committed them: Because St *Paul* does not say he shall have the very *same Body*, when he suffers, that he had when he sinn'd. The Apostle says, indeed done *in his Body*. The Body he had, and did things in at Five or Fifteen, was no doubt *his Body*, as much as that, which he did things in at Fifty was *his Body*, though *his* Body were not *the very same Body* at those different Ages: And so will the Body, which he shall have after the Resurrection, be *his Body*, though it be not the very *same* with that, which he had at Five, or Fifteen, or Fifty. He that at Threescore is broke in the Wheel, for a Murder he committed at Twenty, is punished for what he did in *his* Body, though the Body he has, *i. e. his* Body at Threescore be not the same, *i. e.* made up of the same individual Particles of Matter, that that Body was, which he had forty Years before. When your Lordship has resolved with your self, what that same immutable *he* is, which at the last Judgment shall receive the things done in *his* Body, your Lordship will easily see, that the

† 2 Cor. 5. 10.

‡ P. 38.

Body

Body he had when an *Embryo* in the Womb, when a Child playing in Coats, when a Man marrying a Wife, and when Bed-rid dying of a Consumption, and at last, which he shall have after the Resurrection, are each of them *his* Body, though neither of them be the *same Body*, the one with the other.

But farther to your Lordship's Question, *Can these Words be understood of any other material Substance, but that Body in which these things were done?* I *answer*, These Words of St. *Paul may be understood of another material Substance, than that Body in which these things were done*, because your Lordship teaches me, and gives me a strong Reason so to understand them. Your Lordship says, * That *you do not say the same Particles of Matter, which the Sinner had at the very time of the Commission of his Sins, shall be raised at the last Day.* And your Lordship gives this Reason for it: † *For then a long Sinner must have a vast Body, considering the continual spending of Particles by Perspiration.* Now, my Lord, if the Apostle's Words, as your Lordship would argue, *cannot be understood of any other material Substance, but that Body, in which these things were done*; and no Body upon the Removal or Change of some of the Particles, that at any time makes it up, is the same material Substance, or the same Body; it will, I think, thence follow, that either the Sinner must have all the same individual Particles vitally united to his Soul, when he is raised, that he had vitally united to his Soul, when he sinn'd: Or else St. *Paul*'s Words here cannot be understood to mean the *same Body in which the things were done*. For if there were other Particles of Matter in the Body, wherein the thing was done, than in that which is raised, that which is raised cannot be the *same Body* in which they were done: Unless that alone, which has just all the same individual Particles when any Action is done, being the same Body wherein it was done, that also, which has not the same individual Particles wherein that Action was done, can be the same Body wherein it was done, which is in Effect to make the same Body sometimes to be the same, and sometimes not the same.

* P. 34.

† P. 35.

Your Lordship thinks it suffices to make the *same Body* to have not all; but no other Particles of Matter, but such as were sometime or other vitally united to the Soul before: But such a Body, made up of part of the Particles sometime or other vitally united to the Soul, is no more the same Body wherein the Actions were done in the distant parts of the *long Sinner*'s Life, than that is the same Body in which a quarter, or half, or three quarters, of the same Particle, that made it up, are wanting. For Example, A Sinner has acted here in his *Body* an Hundred Years; he is raised at the last Day, but with what Body? The same, says your Lordship, that he acted in, because St. *Paul* says, he must *receive the things done in his Body*: What therefore must his Body at the Resurrection consist of? Must it consist of all the Particles of Matter that have ever been vitally united to his Soul? For they, in Succession, have all of them made up *his* Body wherein he did *these things*: No, says your Lordship, * that would make his Body too *vast*; it suffices to make the

* P. 35.

same

same Body in which the things were done, that it consists of some of the Particles, and no other but such as were sometime during his Life, vitally united to his Soul. But, according to this Account, *his* Body at the Resurrection, being, as your Lordship seems to limit it, near the same Size it was in some part of his Life, it will be no more the *same Body* in which *the things were done* in the distant Parts of his Life, than that is the *same Body*, in which half, or three quarters, or more of the individual Matter that made it then up, is now wanting. For Example, let *his* Body at 50 Years old consist of a Million of Parts; five hundred thousand at least of those Parts will be different from those which made up *his* Body at 10 Years, and at an hundred. So that to take the numerical Particles, that made up his Body at 50, or any other Season of his Life; or to gather them promiscuously out of those which at different times have successively been vitally united to his Soul, they will no more make the same Body, which was *his*, wherein some of his Actions were done, than that is the same Body, which has but half the same Particles: And yet all your Lordship's Argument here for the same Body, is, because St. *Paul* says it must be *his* Body *in which these things were done*; which it could not be, *if any other Substance were joined to it*, i. e. if any other Particles of Matter made up the Body, which were not vitally united to the Soul, when the Action was done.

Again, your Lordship says, * *That you do not say the same individual Particles* [ shall make up the Body at the Resurrection ] *which were united at the Point of Death, for there must be a great Alteration in them of a lingering Disease, as if a fat Man falls into a Consumption.* Because, this likely, your Lordship thinks these Particles of a decrepit, wasted, withered Body, would be too few, or unfit to make such a plump, strong, vigorous, well-siz'd Body, as it has pleased your Lordship to proportion out in your Thoughts to Men at the Resurrection; and therefore some small Portion of the Particles formerly united vitally to that Man's Soul, shall be re-assumed to make up his Body to the Bulk your Lordship judges convenient; but the greatest part of them shall be left out to avoid the making his Body more *vast* than your Lordship thinks will be fit, as appears by these your Lordships Words immediately following, *viz.* † *That you do not say the same Particles the Sinner had at the very time of Commission of his Sins; for then a long Sinner must have a vast Body.*

* P. 34.

† P. 35.

But then, pray, my Lord, what must an *Embryo* do, who dying within a few Hours after his Body was vitally united to his Soul, has no Particles of Matter, which were formerly vitally united to it, to make up his Body of that Size and Proportion which your Lordship seems to require in Bodies at the Resurrection? Or must we believe he shall remain content with that small Pittance of Matter, and that yet imperfect Body to Eternity, because it is an Article of Faith to believe the *Resurrection of the very same Body?* *i. e.* made up of only such Particles as have been vitally united to the Soul. For if it be so, as your Lordship says, * *That Life is the Result of the Union of Soul and Body*, it will

* P. 43.

will follow. That the Body of an *Embryo* dying in the Womb, may be very little, not the thousandth Part of any ordinary Man. For since from the first Conception and Beginning of Formation it has Life, and *Life is the Result of the Union of the Soul with the Body*; an *Embryo*, that shall die either by the untimely Death of the Mother, or by any other Accident presently after it has Life, must, according to your Lordship's Doctrine, remain a Man not an Inch long to Eternity; because there are not Particles of Matter, formerly united to his Soul, to make him bigger; and no other can be made Use of to that Purpose: Though what greater Congruity the Soul hath with any Particles of Matter, which were once vitally united to it, but are now so no longer, than it hath with Particles of Matter, which it was never united to, would be hard to determine, if that should be demanded.

By these, and not a few other the like Consequences, one may say what Service they do to Religion, and the Christian Doctrine, who raise Questions, and make Articles of Faith about the *Resurrection of the same Body*, where the Scripture says nothing of *the same Body*; or if it does, it is with no small Reprimand * to those who make such an Enquiry. *But some Man will say, How are the Dead raised up? And with what Body do they come? Thou Fool, that which thou sowest, is not quickned, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but bare Grain, it may chance of Wheat, or of some other Grain. But God giveth it a Body as it hath pleased him.* Words I should think sufficient to deter us from determining any thing for or against the same Body being raised at the last Day. It suffices, that all the *Dead shall be raised*, and every one appear and answer for the things done in this Life, and receive according to the things he hath done in his Body, whether good or bad. He that believes this, and has said nothing inconsistent herewith, I presume may, and must be acquitted from being guilty of any thing *inconsistent with the Article of the Resurrection of the Dead.*

* 1 Cor. 15. 35, &c.

But your Lordship, to prove *the Resurrection of the same Body to be an Article of Faith*, farther asks, † *How could it be said, if any other Substance be joined to the Soul at the Resurrection, as its Body, that they were the things done in or by the Body?*

† P. 38.

*Answ.* Just as it may be said of a Man at an hundred Years old, that hath then another Substance joined to his Soul, than he had at twenty, that the Murder or Drunkenness he was guilty of at twenty, *were things done in the Body*: How *by the Body* comes in here, I do not see.

Your Lordship adds, *And St. Paul's Dispute about the Manner of raising the Body, might soon have ended, if there were no Necessity of the same Body.* *Answ.* When I understand what Argument there is in these Words to prove the Resurrection of the same Body, without the Mixture of one new Atom of Matter, I shall know what to say to it. In the mean time this I understand, That St. *Paul* would have put an short an End to all Disputes about this Matter, if he had said, That *there was a Necessity of the same Body*, or that it should be the *same Body*.

The next Text of Scripture you bring for the ſame Body,
* 2 Cor. 15. 16. is, * *If there be no Reſurrection of the Dead, then is not Chriſt raiſed.* From which your Lordſhip argues, † *It*
† P. 38. *ſeems then other Bodies are to be raiſed as his was.* I grant other Dead, as certainly raiſed *as Chriſt was*; for elſe his Reſurrection would be of no Uſe to Mankind. But I do not ſee how it follows, that they ſhall be *raiſed* with the *ſame* Body, as Chriſt was raiſed with the ſame Body, as your Lordſhip infers in theſe Words annexed; *And can there be any Doubt, whether his Body was the ſame material Subſtance which was united to his Soul before?* I anſwer, None at all; nor that it had juſt the ſame undiſtinguiſh'd Lineaments and Marks, yea, and the ſame Wounds that it had at the time of his Death. If therefore your Lordſhip will argue from *other Bodies being raiſed as his was*, That they muſt keep Proportion with his in *Sameneſs*; then we muſt believe, that every Man ſhall be raiſed with the ſame Lineaments and other Notes of Diſtinction he had at the time of his Death, even with his Wounds yet open, if he had any, becauſe our Saviour was ſo raiſed, which ſeems to me ſcarce
* P. 34. reconcilable with what your Lordſhip ſays * of a *fat Man falling into a Conſumption*, and dying.

But whether it will conſiſt or not with your Lordſhip's Meaning in that Place, this to me ſeems a Conſequence that will need to be better proved, *viz.* That our Bodies muſt be raiſed the ſame, juſt as our Saviour's was: Becauſe St. *Paul* ſays, *If there be no Reſurrection of the Dead, then is not Chriſt riſen.* For it may be a good Conſequence Chriſt is riſen, and therefore there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Dead; and yet this may not be a good Conſequence, Chriſt was raiſed with the ſame Body he had at his Death, therefore all Men ſhall be raiſed with the ſame Body they had at their Death, contrary to what your Lordſhip ſays concerning a *fat Man* dying *of a Conſumption*. But the Caſe I think far different betwixt our Saviour, and thoſe to be raiſed at the laſt Day.

1. His Body *ſaw not Corruption*, and therefore to give him another Body, new molded, mixed with other Particles, which were not contained in it as it lay in the Grave, whole and entire as it was laid there, had been to deſtroy his Body to frame him a new one without any need. But why with the remaining Particles of a Man's Body long ſince diſſolved and molder'd into Duſt and Atoms, (whereof poſſibly a great Part may have undergone Variety of Changes, and entred into other Concretions even in the Bodies of other Men) other new Particles of Matter mixed with them, may not ſerve to make *his* Body again, as well as the Mixture of new and different Particles of Matter with the old, did in the Compaſs of his Life make *his* Body, I think no Reaſon can be given?

This may ſerve to ſhew, why though the Materials of our Saviour's Body were not changed at his Reſurrection; yet it does not follow, but that the Body of a Man dead and rotten in his Grave or burnt, may at the laſt Day have ſeveral new Particles in it, and that without any Inconvenience: Since whatever Matter is vitally united to *his* Soul, is *his* Body, as much as is that which was united to it when he was born, or in any other Part of his Life.

2. In

2. In the next Place, the Size, Shape, Figure, and Lineaments of our Saviour's Body, even to his Wounds into which doubting *Thomas* put his Fingers and his Hand, were to be kept in the raised Body of our Saviour, the same they were at his Death, to be a Conviction to his Disciples, to whom he shew'd himself, and who were to be Witnesses of his Resurrection, that their Master, the very same Man, was crucified, dead, and buried, and raised again; and therefore he was handled by them, and eat before them after he was risen, to give them in all Points full Satisfaction, that it was really he, the same, and not another, nor a Spectre or Apparition of him: Though I do not think your Lordship will thence argue, that because *others are to be raised as he was*, therefore it is necessary to believe, that because he eat after his Resurrection, others at the last Day shall eat and drink after they are raised from the Dead, which seems to me as good an Argument, as because his indissolved Body was raised out of the Grave, just as it there lay intire, without the Mixture of any new Particles; therefore the corrupted and consumed Bodies of the Dead at the Resurrection, shall be new framed only out of those scatter'd Particles which were once vitally united to their Souls, without the least Mixture of any one single Atom of new Matter. But at the the last Day, when all Men are raised, there will be no need to be assured of any one particular Man's Resurrection. 'Tis enough that every one shall appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, to receive according to what he had done in his former Life; but in what sort of Body he shall appear, or of what Particles made up, the Scripture having said nothing, but that it shall be a *spiritual Body raised in Incorruption*, it is not for me to determine.

Your Lordship asks, † *Were they* [who saw our Saviour after his Resurrection] *Witnesses only of some material Substance then united to his Soul?* In Answer, I beg your Lordship to consider, whether you suppose our Saviour was to be known to be the same Man (to the Witnesses that were to see him, and testifie his Resurrection) by his Soul, that could neither be seen, nor known to be the same; or by his Body, that could be seen, and by the discernible Structure and Marks of it, be known to be the same? When your Lordship has resolved that, all that you say in that Page, will answer it self. But because one Man cannot know another be the same, but by the outward visible Lineaments, and sensible Marks he has been wont to be known and distinguished by; will your Lordship therefore argue, That the great Judge, at the last Day, who gives to each Man, whom he raises, his new Body, shall not be able to know who is who, unless he give to every one of them a Body, just of the same Figure, Size, and Features, and made up of the very same individual Particles he had in his former Life? Whether such a Way of arguing for the *Resurrection of the same Body, to be an Article of Faith*, contributes much to the strengthening the Credibility of the Article of the Resurrection of the Dead, I shall leave to the Judgment of others.

† P. 39.

Farther, for the proving *the Resurrection of the same Body, to be an Article of Faith*, your Lordship says, * *But the Apostle insists upon the* Resurrection of Christ, *not merely*

* P. 40.

*as an Argument of the Poſſibility of ours, but of the Cer-*
† 1 Cor. 15. *tainty of it*; † *becauſe* he roſe, as the Firſt-fruits; Chriſt
20, 23. the Firſt-fruits, afterwards they that are Chriſt's at his coming. *Anſw.* No doubt *the Reſurrection of Chriſt* is a Proof of the *Certainty of our* Reſurrection. But is it therefore a Proof of the Reſurrection of the *ſame Body*, conſiſting of the ſame individual Particles which concurr'd to the making up of our Body here, without the Mixture of any one other Particle of Matter? I confeſs I ſee no ſuch Conſequence.

But your Lordſhip goes on, * St. *Paul was aware of the*
* P. 40. *Objections in Mens Minds, about the Reſurrection of the ſame Body*; *and it is of great Conſequence as to this Article, to ſhew upon what Grounds he proceeds.* But ſome Man will ſay, How are the *Dead* raiſed up, and with what Body do *they* come? *Firſt he ſhews, That the ſeminal Parts of Plants are wonderfully improved by the ordinary Providence of God, in the Manner of their Vegetation.* *Anſw.* I do not perfectly underſtand, what it is for the *ſeminal Parts of Plants to be wonderfully improved by the ordinary Providence of God, in the Manner of their Vegetation*: Or elſe, perhaps, I ſhould better ſee how this here tends to the Proof of *the Reſurrection of the ſame Body*, in your Lordſhip's Senſe.

It continues, † *They* ſow bare Grain of Wheat, or of
† P. 40. ſome other Grain, but God giveth it a Body, as it hath pleaſeth him, and to every Seed his own Body. *Here*, ſays your Lordſhip, *is an Identity of the material Subſtance ſuppoſed.* It may be ſo. But to me a Diverſity *of the material Subſtance*, i. e. of the component Particles, *is here ſuppoſed*, or indirect Words
* V. 37. ſaid. For the Words of St. *Paul* taken all together, run thus, * *That which thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not* that *Body which ſhall be, but bare Grain*, and ſo on, as your Lordſhip has ſet down the Remainder of them. From which Words of St. *Paul*, the natural Argument ſeems to me to ſtand thus. If the Body that is put in the Earth in ſowing, *is not* that *Body which ſhall be*, then the Body that is put in the Grave, *is not* that, *i. e.* the ſame *Body that ſhall be.*

But your Lordſhip proves it to be the *ſame Body*, by theſe three Greek Words of the Text, τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, which your Lordſhip interprets
† P. 40. thus, † *That proper Body which belongs to it.* *Anſw.* Indeed by thoſe Greek Words, τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, whether our Tranſlators have rightly render'd them *his own Body*, or your Lordſhip more rightly, *that proper Body which belongs to it*, I formerly underſtood no more but this, that in the Production of Wheat, and other Grain from Seed, God continued every Species diſtinct, ſo that from Grains of Wheat ſown, Root, Stalk, Blade, Ear and Grains of Wheat were produced, and not thoſe of Barly; and ſo of the reſt, which I took to be the Meaning of, *to every Seed his own Body.* No, ſays your Lordſhip, theſe Words prove, That to every Plant of Wheat, and to every Grain of Wheat produced in it, is given *the proper Body that belongs to it*, is the ſame Body with the Grain that was ſown. *Anſw.* This, I confeſs, I do not underſtand; becauſe I do not underſtand how one individual Grain can be the *ſame* with twenty, fifty, or an hundred individual Grains; for ſuch ſometimes is the Increaſe.

But

But your Lordship proves it. For, says your Lordship, * *Every Seed having that Body in little, which is afterwards so much inlarged; and in Grain the Seed is corrupted before its Germination; but it hath its proper organical Parts, which make it the same Body with that which it grows up to. For although Grain be not divided into Lobes, as other Seeds are, yet it hath been found, by the most accurate Observations, that upon separating the Membranes, these seminal Parts are discerned in them; which afterwards grow up to that Body which we call Corn.* In which Words I crave leave to observe, that your Lordship supposes, that a Body may be *enlarged* by the Addition of a hundred or a thousand times as much in Bulk as its own Matter, and yet continue the *same Body*; which, I confess, I cannot understand. * P. 40.

But in the next place, if that could be so; and that the Plant, in its full Growth at Harvest, increased by a thousand or a million of times as much new Matter added to it, as it had when it lay in little concealed in the Grain that was sown, was the very same Body: Yet I do not think that your Lordship will say, that every minute, insensible, and inconceivably small Grain of the hundred Grains, contained in that little organized seminal Plant, is every one of them the very same with that Grain which contains that whole little seminal Plant, and all those invisible Grains in it. For then it will follow, that one Grain is the same with an hundred, and an hundred distinct Grains the same with one: Which I shall be able to assent to, when I can conceive, that all the Wheat in the World is but one Grain.

For I beseech you, my Lord, consider what it is St. *Paul* here speaks of: It is plain he speaks of *that which is sown and dies*, i. e. the Grain that the Husbandman takes out of his Barn to sow in his Field. And of this Grain, St. *Paul* says, that it *is not* that Body *that shall be*. These two, *viz. That which is sown*, and *that* Body *that shall be*, are all the Bodies that St. *Paul* here speaks of, to represent the Agreement or Difference of Mens Bodies after the Resurrection, with those they had before they died. Now, I crave leave to ask your Lordship, which of these two is that little invisible seminal Plant, which your Lordship here speaks of? Does your Lordship mean by it the Grain *that is sown*? But that is not what St. *Paul* speaks of, he could not mean this *embryonated* little Plant, for he could not denote it by these Words, *that which thou sowest*, for that he says must *die*: But this little *embryonated* Plant, contained in the Seed that is sown, dies not: Or does your Lordship mean by it, *the* Body *that shall be*? But neither by these Words, *the* Body *that shall be*, can St. *Paul* be supposed to denote this insensible little *embryonated* Plant; for that is already in being contained in the Seed that is sown, and therefore could not be spoke of under the Name of *the* Body *that shall be*. And therefore, I confess, I cannot see of what Use it is to your Lordship to introduce here this third Body, which St. *Paul* mentions not; and to make that the same or not the same with any other, when those which St. *Paul* speaks of, are, as I humbly conceive, these two visible sensible Bodies, the Grain sown, and the Corn grown up to Ear, with neither of which this insensible *embryonated* Plant can be the same Body, unless an insensible Body can be the same Body with a

ſenſible Body, and a little Body can be the ſame Body with one ten thouſand or an hundred thouſand times as big as it ſelf. So that yet I confeſs I ſee not the *Reſurrection of the ſame Body*, proved from theſe Words of St. *Paul*, to be an *Article of Faith*.

* P. 41. Your Lordſhip goes on, * St. Paul *indeed ſaith*, That we ſow not that Body that ſhall be; *but he ſpeaks not of the* Identity, *but the* Perfection *of it*. Here my Underſtanding fails me again: For I cannot underſtand St. *Paul* to ſay, That the ſame Identical ſenſible Grain of Wheat, which was ſown at Seed-time, is the very ſame with every Grain of Wheat in the Ear at Harveſt, that ſprang from it: Yet ſo I muſt underſtand it, to make it prove, That the ſame ſenſible Body, that is laid in the Grave, ſhall be the very ſame with that which ſhall be raiſed at the Reſurrection. For I do not know of any ſeminal *Body in little*, contained in the dead Carcaſs of any Man or Woman, which, as your Lordſhip ſays, in Seeds, having its proper Organical Parts, ſhall *afterwards be enlarged*, and at the Reſurrection grow up into the *ſame Man*. For I never thought of any Seed or *ſeminal Parts*, either of *Plant* or Animal *ſo wonderfully improved by the Providence of God*, whereby the ſame Plant or Animal ſhould beget it ſelf; nor ever heard, that it was by Divine *Providence* deſigned to produce the ſame Individual, but for the producing of future and diſtinct Individuals, for the Continuation of the ſame Species.

* P. 41. Your Lordſhip's next Words are, * *And although there be ſuch a Difference from the Grain it ſelf, when it comes up to be perfect Corn, with Root, Stalk, Blade, and Ear, that it may be ſaid to outward Appearance not to be the ſame Body; yet with regard to the ſeminal and organical Parts, it is as much the ſame, as a Man grown up, is the ſame with the Embryo in the Womb. Anſw.* It does not appear by any thing I can find in the Text, That St. *Paul* here compared the *Body*, produced with the *ſeminal and organical Parts*, contained in the Grain it ſprang from, but with the whole ſenſible Grain that was ſown. Microſcopes had not then diſcovered the little *Embryo* Plant in the Seed; and ſuppoſing it ſhould have been revealed to St. *Paul*, (though in the Scripture we find little Revelation of natural Philoſophy) yet an Argument taken from a thing perfectly unknown to the *Corinthians*, whom he writ to, could be of no manner of Uſe to them; nor ſerve at all either to inſtruct or convince them. But granting that thoſe St. *Paul* writ to, knew it as well as Mr. *Lewenkooke*; yet your Lordſhip thereby proves not the raiſing of *the ſame Body*: Your Lordſhip ſays it is as much the *ſame* [I crave leave to add *Body*] *as a Man grown up is the ſame*, (*ſame*, what I beſeech your Lordſhip? ) *with the Embryo in the Womb*. For that the *Body* of the *Embryo* in the Womb, and *Body* of the Man grown up, is the *ſame Body*, I think no one will ſay; unleſs he can perſwade himſelf, that a *Body* that is not the hundredth part of another, is the ſame with that other, which I think no one will do, till having renounced this dangerous *way by Ideas* of Thinking and Reaſoning, he has learnt to ſay, that a part and the whole are the *ſame*.

Your

Your Lordship goes on, * *And although many Arguments may be used to prove, that a Man is not the same, because Life, which depends upon the Course of the Blood, and the manner of Respiration, and Nutrition, is so different in both States; yet that Man would be thought ridiculous that should seriously affirm, That it was not the* same Man. And your Lordship says, *I grant that the Variation of great Parcels of Matter in Plants, alters not the Identity: And that the Organization of the Parts in one coherent Body, partaking of one common Life, makes the Identity of a Plant. Answ.* My Lord, I think the Question is not about the *same Man*, but the *same Body*. For tho' I do say, † (somewhat differently from what your Lordship sets down as my Words here) 'That that which as such an 'Organization, as is fit to receive and distribute Nourish-'ment, so as to continue and frame the Wood, Bark and Leaves, *&c.* of a 'Plant, in which consists the vegetable Life, continues to be the same Plant; 'as long as it partakes of the same Life, though that Life be communicated 'to new Particles of Matter, vitally united to the living Plant. Yet I do not remember, that I any where say, That a Plant, which was once no bigger than an Oaten Straw, and afterwards grows to be above a Fathom about, is the *same Body*, though it be still the *same Plant*.

* P. 41.

† Essay B. 2. C. 27. §. 4.

The well known Tree in *Epping* Forest, called the *King's Oak*, which, from not weighing an Ounce at first, grew to have many Tuns of Timber in it, was all along the same Oak, the very *same Plant*; but no Body, I think, will say it was the *same Body* when it weighed a Tun, as it was when it weighed but an Ounce, unless he has a mind to signalize himself by saying, That that is the *same Body*, which has a thousand Particles of different Matter in it, for one Particle that is the same; which is no better than to say, That a thousand different Particles are but one and the same Particle, and one and the same Particle is a thousand different Particles; a thousand times a greater Absurdity, than to say half is the whole, or the whole is the same with the half; which will be improved ten thousand times yet farther, if a Man shall say, (as your Lordship seems to me to argue here) That that great Oak is the very same Body with the Acorn it sprang from, because there was in that Acorn an Oak in little, which was *afterwards* (as your Lordship expresses it) so *much enlarged*, as to make that mighty Tree. For this *Embryo*, if I may so call it, or Oak in little, being not the hundredth, or perhaps the thousandth part of the Acorn, and the Acorn being not the thousandth part of the grown Oak, 'twill be very extraordinary to prove the Acorn and the grown Oak to be the *same Body*, by a way wherein it cannot be pretended, that above one Particle of an hundred Thousand, or a Million, is the same in the one Body, that it was in the other. From which way of Reasoning, it will follow that a Nurse and her Sucking-child have the same Body; and be past doubt, that a Mother and her Infant have the same Body. But this is a way of *Certainty* found out to establish the Articles of Faith, and to overturn the new *Method of Certainty* that your Lordship says I have *started, which is apt to leave Mens Minds more doubtful than before.*

And now I deſire your Lordſhip to conſider of what Uſe it is to you in the preſent Caſe, to quote out of my *Eſſay* theſe Words, 'That partaking 'of one common Life, makes the Identity of a Plant, ſince the Queſtion is 'not about the *Identity of a Plant*, but about the *Identity of a Body*. It being a very different thing to be the *ſame Plant*, and to be the *ſame Body*. For that which makes the ſame Plant, does not make the ſame Body; the one being the partaking in the ſame continued vegetable Life, the other the conſiſting of the ſame numerical Particles of Matter. And therefore your Lordſhip's Inference from my Words above quoted,

* *P.* 42. in theſe which you ſubjoin, * ſeems to me a very ſtrange one, *viz. So that in things capable of any ſort of Life, the Identity is conſiſtent with a continued Succeſſion of Parts; and ſo the Wheat grown up, is the* ſame Body *with the Grain that was ſown.* For I believe, if my Words, from which you infer, *and ſo the Wheat grown up is the* ſame Body *with the Grain that was ſown*, were put into a Syllogiſm, this would hardly be brought to be the Concluſion.

But your Lordſhip goes on with Conſequence upon Conſequence, though I have not Eyes acute enough every where to ſee the Connection, till you bring it to the Reſurrection of the *ſame Body*. The Con-

† *P.* 41. nection of your Lordſhip's Words, † are as followeth; *And thus the Alteration of the parts of the Body at the Reſurrection, is conſiſtent with its Identity, if its Organization and Life be the ſame; and this is a real Identity of the* Body, *which depends not upon Conſciouſneſs. From whence it follows, that to make the* ſame Body, *no more is requir'd, but reſtoring Life to the organized Parts of it.* If the Queſtion were about raiſing the ſame Plaint, I do not ſay but there might be ſome Appearance for making ſuch Inference from my Words as this, *Whence it follows, that to make the ſame* Plant, *no more is required, but reſtore Life to the organized Part of it.* But this Deduction, wherein from thoſe Words of mine that ſpeak only of the *Identity of a Plant*, your Lordſhip infers, there is no more required to make the *ſame Body*, than to make the *ſame Plant*, being too ſubtile for me, I leave to my Reader to find out.

Your Lordſhip goes on, and ſays, * *That I grant like-*

* *P.* 42. *wiſe*, 'That the Identity of the ſame Man conſiſts in a 'Participation of the ſame continued Life, by conſtantly 'fleeting Particles of Matter in Succeſſion, vitally united to the ſame organized Body. *Anſw.* I ſpeak in theſe Words of the *Identity of the ſame* Man, and your Lordſhip thence roundly concludes; *ſo that there is no Difficulty of the Sameneſs of the* Body. But your Lordſhip knows, that I do not take theſe two Sounds, *Man* and *Body*, to ſtand for the ſame thing; nor the Identity of the *Man* to be the ſame with the Identity of the *Body*.

But let us read out your Lordſhip's Words, † *So that*

† *P.* 42. *there is no Difficulty as to the Sameneſs of the* Body, *if Life were continued; and if by Divine Power, Life be reſtored to that material Subſtance which was before united by a Re-union of the Soul to it, there is no Reaſon to deny the Identity of the* Body. *Not from the Conſciouſneſs of the Soul, but from that Life which is the Reſult of the Union of the Soul and* Body.

If

If I understand your Lordship right, you in these Words, from the Passages above quoted out of my Book, argue, that from those Words of mine it will follow, That it is or may be the *same Body* that is raised at the Resurrection. If so, my Lord, your Lordship has then proved, That my Book is not inconsistent with, but conformable to this Article of the *Resurrection of the same Body*, which your Lordship contends for, and will have to be an Article of Faith: For though I do by no means deny, that the *same* Bodies shall be raised at the last Day, yet I see nothing your Lordship has said to prove it to be an Article of Faith.

But your Lordship goes on with your Proofs, and says, * *But St.* Paul *still supposes, that it must be that material Substance to which the Soul was before united. For, saith he,* it is sown in Corruption, it is raised in Incorruption: It is sown in Dishonour, it is raised in Glory: It is sown in Weakness, it is raised in Power: It is sown a Natural Body, it is raised a Spiritual Body. *Can such a material Substance which was never united to the Body, be said to be* sown *in* Corruption, *and* Weakness, *and* Dishonour? *Either therefore he must speak of the same Body, or his Meaning cannot be comprehended.* I answer, *Can such a material Substance which was* never laid in the Grave, *be said to be sown*, &c? For your Lordship says, † *You do not say the same individual Particles, which were united at the point of Death, shall be raised at the last Day*; and no other Particles are laid in the Grave, but such as are united at the point of Death; *either therefore your Lordship must speak* of another Body different from that which was *sown*, which shall be raised, *or else* your *Meaning*, I think, *cannot be comprehended.*

* *P.* 43.

† *P.* 34.

But whatever be your Meaning, your Lordship proves it to be St. *Paul's* Meaning, That the *same Body* shall be raised which was *sown*, in these following Words, ‡ *For what does all this relate to a conscious Principle? Answ.* The Scripture being express, That the same Persons should be raised and appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that every one may receive according to what he had done in his Body; it was very well suited to common Apprehensions, (which refined not about *Particles that had been vitally united to the Soul*) to speak of the Body which each one was to have after the Resurrection, as he would be apt to speak of it himself. For it being *his* Body both before and after the Resurrection, every one ordinarily speaks to *his* Body as the same, though in a strict and philosophical Sense, as your Lordship speaks, it be not the very same. Thus it is no Impropriety of Speech to say, This Body of mine, which was formerly strong and plump, is now weak and wasted, though in such a Sense as you are speaking in here, it be not the same Body. Revelation declares nothing any where concerning *the same Body*, in your Lordship's Sense of *the same Body*, which appears not to have been then thought of. The Apostle directly proposes nothing for or against *the same Body*, as necessary to be believed; That which he is plain and direct in, is opposing and condemning such curious Questions about the Body, which could serve only to perplex, not to confirm what was material

‡ *P.* 43.

and

and necessary for them to believe, *viz.* a Day of Judgment and Retribution to Men in a future State, and therefore 'tis no wonder that mentioning their Bodies he should use a way of speaking suited to vulgar Notions, from which it would be hard positively to conclude any thing for the determining of this Question (especially against Expressions in the same Discourse that plainly incline to the other side) in a Matter which as it appears, the Apostle thought not necessary to determine; and the Spirit of God thought not fit to gratifie any ones Curiosity in.

† P. 43. But your Lordship says, † *The Apostle speaks plainly of that Body which was once quickened, and afterwards falls to Corruption, and is to be restor'd with more noble Qualities.* I wish your Lordship had quoted the Words of St. *Paul*, wherein *he* speaks plainly of that numerical *Body that was once quickened*, they would presently decide this Question. But your Lordship proves it by these following Words of St. *Paul*: *For this Corruption must put on Incorruption, and this Mortal must put on Immortality*; to which your Lordships adds, That *you do not see how he could more expressly affirm the Identity of this corruptible Body, with that after the Resurrection.* How expressly it is affirmed by the Apostle, shall be consider'd by and by. In the mean time it is past doubt, that your Lordship best knows what you do or *do not see.* But this I will be bold to say, that if St. *Paul* had any where in this Chapter (where there are so many Occasions for it, if it had been necessary to have been believed) but said in express Words, that the *same Bodies* should be raised, every one else, who thinks of it, will *see* he had *more expressly affirmed the Identity* of the Bodies which Men now have, with those they shall have after the Resurrection.

* P. 44. The remainder of your Lordship's Period, * is; *And that without any respect to the Principle of Self-consciousness. Answ.* These Words, I doubt not, have some Meaning, but I must own, I know not what; either towards the Proof of *the Resurrection of the same Body*, or to shew, that any thing I have said concerning *Self-consciousness*, is inconsistent: For I do not remember that I have any where said, That the *Identity* of *Body* consisted in *Self-consciousness.*

† P. 44. From your preceding Words, your Lordship concludes thus. † *And so if the Scripture be the sole Foundation of our Faith, this is an Article of it.* My Lord, to make the Conclusion unquestionable, I humbly conceive, the Words must run thus. And so if *the Scripture*, and your Lordship's Interpretation of it, *be the sole Foundation of our Faith*, the Resurrection of the same Body *is an Article of it.* For with Submission, your Lordship has neither produced express Words of Scripture for it, nor so proved that to be the Meaning of any of those Words of Scripture which you have produced for it, that a Man who reads and sincerely endeavours to understand the Scripture, cannot but find himself obliged to believe, as expressly that *the same Bodies of the Dead*, in your Lordship's Sense, shall be raised, as that *the Dead shall be raised.* And I crave leave to give your Lordship this one Reason for it,

Bp.

He who reads with Attention this Discourse of St. *Paul*, * where he discourses of the Resurrection, will see, that he plainly distinguishes between *the Dead* that shall be raised, and *the Bodies* of the Dead. For it is νεκροὶ, πάντες, ὅτι, † are the Nominative Cases to † ἐγείρεται, ζωοποιηθήσονται, ἐγερθήσονται, all along, and not σώματα *Bodies*, which one may with Reason think would somewhere or other have been expressed, if all this had been said, to propose it as an Article of Faith, that the very same Bodies should be raised. The same manner of speaking the Spirit of God observes all through the New Testament, where it is said, ‡ raise the *Dead*, *quicken* or make alive the *Dead*, the Resurrection of the *Dead*. Nay, these very Words of our Saviour, * urged by your Lordship, for the Resurrection of the *same Body*, run thus. Πάντες οἱ ἐν ταῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύσονται οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως. Would a well-meaning Searcher of the Scriptures be apt to think, that if the thing here intended by our Saviour were to teach, and propose it as an Article of Faith, necessary to be believed by every one, that the *very same Bodies of the Dead* should be raised; would not, I say, any one be apt to think, that if our Saviour meant so, the Words should have rather been, πάντα τὰ σώματα ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, i. e. all the Bodies that *are in the Graves*, rather than *all who are in the Graves*; which must denote Persons, and not precisely Bodies?

* 1 Cor. 15.
† V. 15. 22, 23, 39, 32, 35, 52.
‡ Matt. 22. 31.
Mark 12. 26.
John 5. 21.
Acts 26.
Rom. 4. 17.
2 Cor. 1. 9.
1 Thes. 4. 14, 16.
* John 5. 28, 29.

Another Evidence, that St. *Paul* makes a Distinction between *the Dead* and the *Bodies of the Dead*, so that the Dead cannot be taken in this, 1 *Cor.* c. 15. to stand precisely for the Bodies of the Dead, are these Words of the Apostle, ‡ *But some Men will say, How are the* Dead *raised? and with what* Bodies *do* they *come?* Which Words, *Dead* and *They*, if supposed to stand precisely for the *Bodies* of the Dead, the Question will run thus. *How are the dead* Bodies *raised? and with what Bodies do* the dead Bodies *come?* which seems to have no very agreeable Sense.

‡ V. 35.

This therefore being so, that the Spirit of God keep so expressly to this Phrase, or form of Speaking in the New Testament, of *raising*, *quickening*, *rising*, *Resurrection*, &c. of the *Dead*, where the Resurrection at the last Day is spoken of; and that the Body is not mentioned, but in answer to this Question, *With what Bodies shall those Dead*, who are raised, *come?* So that by the Dead cannot precisely be meant *the dead Bodies*: I do not see but a good Christian, who reads the Scripture, with an Intention to believe all that is there revealed to him concerning the Resurrection, may acquit himself of his Duty therein, without entering into the Enquiry, whether the Dead shall have the *very same Bodies* or no? Which sort of Enquiry the Apostle, by the Appellation he bestows here on him that makes it, seems

ſeems not much to encourage. Nor, if he ſhall think himſelf bound to determine concerning the Identity of the Bodies of the Dead raiſed at the laſt Day, will he, by the remainder of St. *Paul*'s Anſwer, find the Determination of the Apoſtle to be much in favour of the very *ſame Body*, unleſs the being told, that the Body ſown, *is not that Body that ſhall be?* That the Body raiſed is as different from that which was laid down, as the *Fleſh of Man* is from the *Fleſh* of *Beaſts*, *Fiſhes* and *Birds*, or as the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* are different one from another, or as different as a corruptible, weak, natural, mortal Body, is from an incorruptible, powerful, ſpiritual, immortal Body; and laſtly, as different as a Body that is *Fleſh and Blood*, is from a Body that is not Fleſh and Blood. For *Fleſh and Blood cannot*,

‡ V. 50. ſays St. *Paul*, in this very place, ‡ *inherit the Kingdom of God*; unleſs, I ſay, all this, which is contained in St. *Paul*'s Words, can be ſuppoſed to be the way to deliver this as an Article of Faith, which is required to be believed by every one, *viz.* That the *Dead ſhould be raiſed with the very ſame Bodies that they had before in this Life*; which Article propoſed in theſe or the like plain and expreſs Words, could have left no room for Doubt in the meaneſt Capacities; nor for Conteſt in the moſt perverſe Minds.

Your Lordſhip adds, in the next Words, * *And ſo it*

* P. 44. *hath been always underſtood by the Chriſtian Church*, viz. *That the Reſurrection of the ſame Body*, in your Lordſhip's Senſe of *ſame Body*, *is an Article of Faith*. *Anſw.* What the *Chriſtian Church has always underſtood*, is beyond my Knowledge. But for thoſe who coming ſhort of your Lordſhip's great Learning, cannot gather their Articles of Faith from the Underſtanding of all the whole Chriſtian Church, ever ſince the Preaching of the Goſpel, (who make the far greater Part of Chriſtians, I think I may ſay, nine hundred ninety and nine of a Thouſand) but are forced to have Recourſe to the Scripture, to find them there, I do not ſee, that they will eaſily find there this propoſed as an Article of Faith, that there ſhall be *a Reſurrection of the ſame Body*; but that there ſhall be *a Reſurrection of the Dead*, without explicitly determining, That they ſhall by raiſed with Bodies made up wholly of the ſame Particles which were once vitally united to their Souls, in their former Life, without the Mixture of any one other Particle of Matter; which is that which your Lordſhip means by the *ſame Body*.

But ſuppoſing your Lordſhip to have demonſtrated this to be an Article of Faith, though I crave leave to own, that I do not ſee, that all that your Lordſhip has ſaid here, makes it ſo much as probable; What is all this to me? Yes, ſays your Lordſhip in the following Words, †

† P. 44. *My* Idea *of perſonal Identity is inconſiſtent with it, for it makes the ſame Body which was here united to the Soul, not to be neceſſary to the Doctrine of the Reſurrection. But any material Subſtance united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame Body.*

This is an Argument of your Lordſhip's which I am oblig'd to anſwer to. But is it not fit I ſhould firſt underſtand it, before I anſwer it? Now, here I do

do not well know, what it is *to make a thing not to be neceſſary to the Doctrine of the Reſurrection.* But to help my ſelf out the beſt I can, with a Gueſs, I will conjecture (which in diſputing with learned Men, is not very ſafe) your Lordſhip's Meaning is, That *my* Idea *of perſonal Identity makes it not neceſſary*, that for the raiſing the ſame Perſon, the Body ſhould be the ſame.

Your Lordſhip's next Word is *But*, to which I am ready to reply, *But* what? What does *my* Idea of perſonal Identity do? For ſomething of that kind the adverſative Particle *But* ſhould in the ordinary Conſtruction of our Language, introduce to make the Propoſition clear and intelligible: But here is no ſuch thing, *But* is one of your Lordſhip's priviledged Particles, which I muſt not meddle with, for fear your Lordſhip complain of me again, as ſo *ſevere a Critick*, that *for the leaſt Ambiguity in any Particle, fill up Pages in my Anſwer, to make my* Book *look conſiderable for the* Bulk *of it.* But ſince this Propoſition here, *my* Idea *of a perſonal Identity makes the ſame* Body *which was here united to the Soul, not neceſſary to the Doctrine of the Reſurrection.* But *any material Subſtance being united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame* Body, is brought to prove *my* Idea *of perſonal Identity inconſiſtent* with the Article of the Reſurrection; I muſt make it out in ſome direct Senſe or other, that I may ſee whether it be both true and concluſive. I therefore venture to read it thus, *my* Idea *of perſonal Identity makes the ſame* Body *which was here united to the Soul, not to be neceſſary* at the Reſurrection, *but* allows, That *any material Subſtance being united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame* Body, Ergo, *my Idea of Perſonal Identity, is inconſiſtent with the Article of the Reſurrection of the ſame* Body.

If this be your Lordſhip's Senſe in this Paſſage, as I here have gueſſed it to be, or elſe I know not what it is. I anſwer,

1. That *my Idea of perſonal Identity* does not allow, that *any material Subſtance, being united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame* Body. I ſay no ſuch thing in my Book, nor any thing from whence it may be infer'd; and your Lordſhip would have done me a Favour to have ſet down the Words where I ſay ſo, or thoſe from which you infer ſo, and ſhew'd how it follows from any thing I have ſaid.

2. Granting, that it were a Conſequence from *my Idea of perſonal Identity*, that *any material Subſtance being united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame* Body; this would not prove that *my Idea of perſonal Identity was inconſiſtent* with this Propoſition, *That the ſame Body ſhall be raiſed*; but on the contrary, affirms it: Since if I affirm, as I do, That the ſame Perſons ſhall be raiſed, and it be a Conſequence of my Idea of perſonal Identity, that *any material Subſtance being united to the ſame Principle of Conſciouſneſs, makes the ſame* Body; it follows, that if the ſame Perſon be raiſed, the ſame Body muſt be raiſed; and ſo I have herein not only ſaid nothing inconſiſtent with the Reſurrection of the ſame Body, but have ſaid more for it than your Lordſhip. For there can be nothing plainer, than that in the Scripture it is revealed, That the ſame Perſons ſhall be raiſed, and appear before the Judgment-Seat of Chriſt,

to

to answer for what they have done in their Bodies. If therefore *whatever Matter* be joined to the same Principle of Consciousness make the same Body, it is Demonstration, That if the same Persons are raised, they have the same Bodies.

How then your Lordship makes this an Inconsistency with the Resurrection, is beyond my Conception. Yes, says your Lordship, †

† P. 44. *it is inconsistent with it, for it makes the same Body which was here united to the Soul, not to be necessary.*

3. I answer therefore Thirdly, That this is the first time I ever learnt, That not *necessary* was the same with *inconsistent*. I say, that a Body made up of the same numerical Parts of Matter, is not necessary to the making of the same Person; from whence it will indeed follow, that to the Resurrection of the same Person, the same numerical Particles of Matter are not required. What does your Lordship infer from hence? to wit, this: Therefore he who thinks, that the same Particles of Matter are not necessary to the making of the same Person, cannot believe, that the same Persons shall be raised with Bodies made of the very same Particles of Matter, if God should reveal, that it shall be so, *viz.* That the same Persons shall be raised with the same Bodies they had before. Which is all one as to say, That he who thought the blowing of Rams Horns was not necessary in it self to the falling down of the Walls of *Jericho*, could not believe, that they should fall upon the blowing of Rams Horns, when God had declared it should be so.

Your Lordship says, *My Idea of personal Identity is inconsistent with the Article of the Resurrection*; the Reason you ground it on, is this, because it makes not the same Body *necessary* to the making the same Person. Let us grant your Lordship's Consequence to be good, what will follow from it? No less than this, That your Lordship's Notion (for I dare not say your Lordship has any so dangerous things as *Ideas*) of personal Identity, is inconsistent with *the Article of the Resurrection*. The De-

* P. 34, 35. monstration of it, is thus; your Lordship says, * It is not necessary that the Body, to be raised at the last Day, should consist of *the same Particles of Matter which were united at the Point of Death; for there must be a great Alteration in them in a lingring Disease, as if a fat Man fall into a Consumption: You do not say the same Particles with which the Sinner had at the very time of Commission of his Sins; for then a long Sinner must have a vast Body, considering the continual spending of Particles by Perspiration.* And again, here your Lord-

† P. 44. ship says, † *You allow the Notion of Personal Identity to belong to the same Man under several Changes of Matter.* From which Words it is evident, That your Lordship supposes a Person in this World may be continued and preserved the same in a Body not consisting of the same individual Particles of Matter; and hence it demonstratively follows, That let your Lordship's *Notion of personal Identity* be what it will, it makes *the same Body not to be necessary to the same Person*; and therefore it is by your Lordship's Rule *inconsistent, with the Article of the Resurrection.* When your Lordship shall think fit to clear your own *Notion*

of

*of personal Identity* from this *Inconsistency* with the Article of the Resurrection, I do not doubt but my *Idea of personal Identity* will be thereby cleared too. Till then, all *Inconsistency* with that Article, which your Lordship has here charged on mine, will unavoidably fall upon your Lordship's too.

But for the clearing of both, give me leave to say, my Lord, That whatsoever is *not necessary*, does not thereby become *inconsistent*. It is *not necessary* to the same *Person*, that his Body should always consist of the same numerical Particles; this is Demonstration, because the Particles of the Bodies of the same Persons in this Life change every moment, and your Lordship cannot deny it; and yet this makes it not *inconsistent* with God's preserving, if he thinks fit, to the same Persons, Bodies consisting of the same numerical Particles always from the Resurrection to Eternity. And so likewise, though I say any thing that supposes it *not necessary*, that the same numerical Particles, which were vitally united to the Soul in this Life, should be re-united to it at the Resurrection, and constitute the Body it shall then have; yet it is not *inconsistent* with this, That God may, if he pleases, give to every one a Body consisting only of such Particles as were before vitally united to his Soul. And thus I think, I have cleared my Book from all that *Inconsistency* which your Lordship charges on it, and would perswade the World it has with the *Article of the Resurrection of the Dead.*

Only before I leave it, I will set down the remainder of what your Lordship says upon this Head, that though I see not the Coherence nor Tendency of it, nor the Force of any Argument in it against me; yet that nothing may be omitted that your Lordship has thought fit to entertain your Reader with on this new Point, nor any one have Reason to suspect, that I have passed by any Word of your Lordship's, (on this now first introduced Subject) wherein he might find your Lordship had proved what you had promised in your Title-page. Your remaining Words are these; † *The dispute is not how far personal Identity in itself may consist in the very same material Substance; for we allow the Notion of personal Identity to belong to the same Man under several Changes of Matter; but whether it doth not depend upon a vital Union between the Soul and Body, and the Life, which is consequent upon it; and therefore in the Resurrection, the same material Substance must be re-united, or else it cannot be called a Resurrection, but a* Renovation, *i. e. it may be a new Life, but not a raising the Body from the Dead.* I confess, I do not see how what is here ushered in by the Words *and therefore*, is a Consequence from the preceding Words; but as to the Propriety of the Name, I think it will not be much questioned, that if the same Man rise who was dead, it may very properly be called the *Resurrection of the Dead*; which is the Language of the Scripture.

† P. 44.

I must not part with this Article of the Resurrection, without returning my Thanks to your Lordship for making me * take notice of a Fault in my *Essay*. When I writ that Book, I took it for granted, as I doubt not but many others have done, that the Scripture had mention'd in express Terms, *the Resurrection of the Body*. But upon the Occasion your Lordship has given me in your last Let er,

* P. 62.

to

to look a little more narrowly into what Revelation has declar'd concerning the *Resurrection*, and finding no such expres Words in the Scripture, as that *the* Body *shall rise* or *be raised*, or the *Resurrection of the* Body. I shall in the next Edition of it change these Words of my † Essay B. 4. C. 18. §. 7. Book, † *The dead Bodies of Men shall rise*, into these of the Scripture, *The Dead shall rise*. Not that I question, that the Dead shall be raised with Bodies; but in Matters of Revelation, I think it not only safest, but our Duty, as far as any one delivers it for Revelation, to keep close to the Words of the Scripture; unless he will assume to himself the Authority of one inspired, or make himself wiser than the Holy Spirit himself. If I had spoke of the Resurrection in precisely Scripture Terms, I had avoided giving your * P. 63. Lordship the occasion of making here * such a verbal Reflection on my Words; *What not, if there be an Idea of Identity as to the* Body?

---

# CHAP. XXVIII.

## *Of other Relations.*

*Proportional.* §. 1. BEsides the before-mentioned Occasions of Time, Place, and Casualty of comparing, or referring Things one to another, there are, as I have said, infinite others, some whereof I shall mention.

*First*, The first I shall name, is some one simple *Idea*; which being capable of Parts or Degrees, affords an Occasion of comparing the Subject wherein it is to one another, in Respect of that simple *Idea*, *v. g. Whiter*, *Sweeter*, *Bigger*, *Equal*, *More*, &c. These Relations depending on the Equality and Excess of the same simple *Idea*, in several Subjects, may be called, if one will, *Proportional*; and that these are only conversant about those simple *Ideas* received from Sensation or Reflection, is so evident, that nothing need be said to evince it.

*Natural.* §. 2. *Secondly*, Another Occasion of comparing Things together, or considering one thing, so as to include in that Consideration some other thing, is the Circumstances of their Origin or Beginning; which being not afterwards to be altered, make the Relations depending

ing thereon as lasting as the Subjects to which they belong; *v. g. Father* and *Son*, *Brothers*, *Cousin-Germans*, &c. which have their Relations by one Community of Blood, wherein they partake in several Degrees; *Country-men*, *i. e.* those who were born in the same Country, or Tract of Ground; and these I call *natural Relations*: Wherein we may observe, that Mankind have fitted their Notions and Words to the Use of common Life, and not to the Truth and Extent of Things. For 'tis certain, that in Reality the Relation is the same betwixt the Begetter and the Begotten, in the several Races of other Animals, as well as Men: But yet 'tis seldom said, This Bull is the Grandfather of such a Calf; or that two Pidgeons are Cousin-Germans. It is very convenient, that by distinct Names these Relations should be observed, and marked out in Mankind, there being Occasion, both in Laws, and other Communications one with another, to mention and take notice of Men under these Relations: From whence also arise the Obligations of several Duties amongst Men: Whereas in Brutes, Men having very little or no Cause to mind these Relations, they have not thought fit to give them distinct and peculiar Names. This, by the Way, may give us some Light into the different State and Growth of Languages: which being suited only to the Convenience of Communication, are proportioned to the Notions Men have, and the Commerce of Thoughts familiar amongst them; and not to the Reality or Extent of Things, nor to the various Respects might be found among them; nor the different abstract Considerations might be framed about them. Where they had no Philosophical Notions, there they had no Terms to express them: And 'tis no wonder Men should have framed no Names for those Things they found no Occasion to discourse of. From whence it is easy to imagine, why, as in some Countries, they may not have so much as the Name for a Horse; and in others, where they are more careful of the Pedigrees of their Horses than of their own, that there they may have not only Names for particular Horses, but also of their several Relations of Kindred one to another.

§. 3. *Thirdly*, Sometimes the Foundation of considering Things, with Reference to one another, is some Act whereby any one comes by a Moral Right, Power, or Obligation to do something. Thus a *General* is one that hath Power to command an Army; and an Army under a General, is a Collection of armed Men obliged to obey one Man. A *Citizen*, or a *Burgher*, is one who has a Right to cer- *Instituted.*

tain Privileges in this or that Place. All this sort depending upon Mens Wills, or Agreement in Society, I call *instituted*, or *voluntary*, and may be distinguished from the natural, in that they are most, if not all of them, some way or other alterable, and separable from the Persons to whom they have sometimes belonged, though neither of the Substances, so related, be destroy'd. Now, though these are all reciprocal, as well as the rest, and contain in them a Reference of two Things one to the other; yet, because one of the two Things often wants a relative Name, importing that Reference Men usually take no Notice of it, and the Relation is commonly over-look'd, *v. g.* a *Patron* and *Client* are easily allow'd to be Relations: But a *Constable*, or *Dictator*, are not so readily, at first Hearing, considered as such; because there is no peculiar Name for those who are under the Command of a Dictator, or Constable, expressing a Relation to either of them; though it be certain, that either of them hath a certain Power over some others; and so is so far related to them, as well as a Patron is to his Client, or General to his Army.

*Moral.*

§. 4. *Fourthly*, There is another sort of Relation, which is the Conformity, or Disagreement, Mens voluntary Actions have to a Rule to which they are referred, and by which they are judged of; which, I think, may be called *Moral Relation*, as being that which denominates our Moral Actions, and deserves well to be examined, there being no Part of Knowledge wherein we should be more careful to be determined *Ideas*, and avoid, as much as may be, Obscurity and Confusion. Human Actions, when with their various Ends, Objects, Manners, and Circumstances, they are framed into distinct complex *Ideas*, are, as has been shewn, so many *mixed Modes*, a great part whereof have Names annexed to them. Thus, supposing Gratitude to be a Readiness to acknowledge and return Kindness received; Polygamy to be the having more Wives than one at once: When we frame these Notions thus in our Minds, we have there so many determined *Ideas* of mixed Modes. But this is not all that concerns our Actions; it is not enough to have determined *Ideas* of them, and to know what Names belong to such and such Combinations of *Ideas*. We have a farther and greater Concernment, and that is, to know whether such Actions so made up are morally good or bad.

*Moral Good and Evil.*

§. 5. Good and Evil, as hath been shewn, B. II. Ch. XX. §. 2. and Ch. XXI. §. 42. are nothing but Pleasure or Pain, or that which occasions, or procures Pleasure or Pain to us. *Morally Good and Evil*

*Evil* then, is only the Conformity or Disagreement of our voluntary Actions to some Law, whereby Good and Evil is drawn on us from the Will and Power of the Law-maker; which Good and Evil, Pleasure or Pain, attending our Observance, or Breach of the Law, by the Decree of the Law-maker, is that we call *Reward* and *Punishment*.

§. 6. Of these *Moral Rules*, or Laws, to which Men generally refer, and by which they judge of the Rectitude or Pravity of their Actions, there seem to me to be *three sorts*, with their three different Enforcements, or Rewards and Punishments. For since it would be utterly in vain to suppose a Rule set to the free Actions of Man, without annexing to it some Enforcement of Good and Evil to determine his Will, we must, where-ever we suppose a Law, suppose also some Reward or Punishment annexed to that Law. It would be in vain for one intelligent Being to set a Rule to the Actions of another, if he had it not in his Power to reward the Compliance with, and punish Deviation from his Rule, by some Good and Evil, that is not the natural Product and Consequence of the Action it self. For that being a natural Convenience, or Inconvenience, would operate of it self without a Law. This, if I mistake not, is the true Nature of all *Law*, properly so called. *Moral Rules.*

§. 7. The Laws that Men generally refer their Actions to, to judge of their Rectitude, or Obliquity, seem to me to be these three. 1. The *Divine* Law. 2. The *Civil* Law. 3. The Law of *Opinion* or *Reputation*, if I may so call it. By the Relation they bear to the first of these, Men judge whether their Actions are Sins, or Duties; by the second, whether they be criminal, or innocent; and by the third, whether they be Vertues or Vices. *Laws.*

§. 8. *First*, The *Divine* Law, whereby I mean that Law which God has set to the Actions of Men, whether promulgated to them by the Light of Nature, or the Voice of Revelation. That God has given a Rule whereby Men should govern themselves, I think there is no Body so brutish as to deny. He has a Right to do it, we are his Creatures: He has Goodness and Wisdom to direct our Actions to that which is best; and he has Power to enforce it by Rewards and Punishments, of infinite Weight and Duration, in another Life; for no Body can take us out of his Hands. This is the only true Touchstone of *Moral Rectitude*; and by comparing them to this Law, it is that Men judge of the most considerable *Moral Good* or *Evil* *Divine Law, the Measure of Sin and Duty.*

of their Actions; that is, whether as *Duties, or Sins*, they are like to procure them Happiness or Misery from the Hands of the ALMIGHTY.

*Civil Law, the Measure of Crimes and Innocence.*

§. 9. *Secondly*, The *Civil* Law, the Rule set by the Commonwealth to the Actions of those who belong to it, is another Rule to which Men refer their Actions, to judge whether they be *criminal* or no. This Law no Body over-looks; the Rewards and Punishments that enforce it being ready at Hand, and suitable to the Power that makes it; which is the Force of the Commonwealth, engaged to protect the Lives, Liberties, and Possessions of those who live according to its Laws, and has Power to take away Life, Liberty, or Goods from him who disobeys; which is the Punishment of Offences committed against this Law.

*Philosophical Law, the Measure of Vertue and Vice.*

§. 10. *Thirdly*, The *Law of Opinion or Reputation.* Vertue and Vice are Names pretended, and supposed every-where to stand for Actions in their own Nature right and wrong: And as far as they really are so applied, they so far are co-incident with the *Divine Law* above-mentioned. But yet, whatever is pretended, this is visible, that these Names, *Vertue* and *Vice*, in the particular Instances of their Application, through the several Nations and Societies of Men in the World, are constantly attributed only to such Actions, as in each Country and Society are in Reputation or Discredit. Nor is it to be thought strange, that Men every-where should give the Name of *Vertue* to those Actions, which amongst them are judged Praise-worthy; and call that *Vice*, which they account blameable: Since otherwise they would condemn themselves, if they should think any thing *Right*, to which they allow'd not Commendation; any thing *Wrong*, which they let pass without Blame. Thus the Measure of what is every-where called and esteemed *Vertue* and *Vice*, is this Approbation or Dislike, Praise or Blame, which by a secret and tacit Consent establishes it self in the several Societies, Tribes, and Clubs of Men in the World; whereby several Actions come to find Credit or Disgrace amongst them, according to the Judgment, Maxims, or Fashions of that Place. For though Men uniting into politick Societies, have resigned up to the Publick the disposing of all their Force, so that they cannot employ it against any Fellow-Citizen any farther than the Law of the Country directs; yet they retain still the Power of thinking well or ill, approving or disapproving

of

of the Actions of those whom they live amongst, and converse with: And by this Approbation and Dislike, they establish amongst themselves what they will call *Vertue* and *Vice*.

§. 11. That this is the common *Measure of Vertue and Vice*, will appear to any one, who considers, that though that passes for *Vice* in one Country, which is counted a *Vertue*, or at least not *Vice* in another; yet every-where, *Vertue* and Praise, *Vice* and Blame go together. *Vertue* is every-where that which is thought Praise-worthy; and nothing else but that which has the Allowance of publick Esteem, is called *Vertue*. * *Vertue* and Praise are so united, that they are called often by the same Name.

* Our Author, in his Preface of the 4th Edition, taking Notice how apt Men have been to mistake him, added what here follows. 'Of this the 'Ingenious Author of *the Discourse concerning the Nature of Man*, has given me a late Instance, to mention no other. For the Civility of his Expressions, and the Candor that belongs to his Order, forbid me to think, that he would have closed his Preface with an Insinuation, as if in what I had said Book 2. Chap. 28. concerning the third Rule which Men refer their Actions to, I went about to make *Vertue Vice*, and *Vice Vertue*, unless he had mistaken my Meaning; which he could not have done, if he had but given himself the Trouble to consider what the Argument was I was then upon, and what was the chief Design of that Chapter, plainly enough set down in the fourth Section, and those following. For I was there, not laying down moral Rules, but shewing the Original and Nature of moral *Ideas*, and enumerating the Rules Men make Use of in moral Relations, whether those Rules were true or false: And pursuant thereunto, I tell what has every where that Denomination, which in the Language of that Place answers to *Vertue* and *Vice* in ours, which *alter not the Nature of Things*, though Men generally do judge of, and denominate their Actions according to the Esteem and Fashion of the Place, or Sect they are of.

If he had been at the Pains to reflect on what I had said, B. 1. c. 3. §. 18. and in this present Chapter, §. 13, 14, 15, and 20, he would have known what I think of the eternal and unalterable Nature of Right and Wrong, and what I call *Virtue* and *Vice*: And if he had observed, that in the Place he quotes, I only report as Matter of Fact what others call *Virtue* and *Vice*, he would not have found it liable to any great Exception. For, I think, I am not much out in saying, that one of the Rules made use of in the World for a Ground or Measure of a Moral Relation, is that Esteem and Reputation, which several sorts of Actions find variously in the several Societies of Men, according to which they are there called *Vertues* or *Vices*: And whatever Authority the learned Mr. *Lowde* places in his *old English Dictionary*, I dare say it no where tells him, (if I should appeal to it) that the same Action is not in Credit, call'd and counted a *Vertue* in one place, which being in Disrepute, passes for, and under the Name of *Vice* in ano-

Name. *Sunt ſua præmia Laudi*, ſays *Virgil*; and ſo *Cicero*, *Nihil habet natura præſtantius, quam Honeſtatem, quam Laudem, quam Dignitatem, quam Decus*, which he tells you, are all Names for the ſame thing, *Tuſc. l.* 2. This is the Language of the Heathen Philoſophers, who well underſtood wherein their Notions of *Vertue* and *Vice* conſiſted. And though, perhaps, by the different Temper, Education, Faſhion, Maxims, or Intereſt of different ſorts of Men, it fell out, that what was thought Praiſe-worthy in one Place, eſcaped not Cenſure in another; and ſo in different Societies, *Vertues* and *Vices* were chang'd: Yet, as to the Main, they for the moſt part kept the ſame every-where.

---

ther. The taking notice that Men beſtow the Names of *Vertue* and *Vice* according to this Rule of Reputation, is all I have done, or can be laid to my Charge to have done, towards the making *Vice Vertue*, and *Vertue Vice*. But the good Man does well, and as becomes his Calling, to be watchful in ſuch Points, and to take the Alarm, even at Expreſſions, which ſtanding alone by themſelves, might ſound ill, and be ſuſpected.

'Tis to this Zeal, allowable in his Function, that I forgive his citing, as he does, theſe Words of mine in §. 11. of this Chap. *The Exhortations of inſpired Teachers, have not feared to appeal to common Repute, whatſoever Things are lovely, whatſoever Things are of good Report, if there be any Vertue, if there be any Praiſe*, &c. *Phil.* 4. 8 without taking notice of thoſe immediately preceding, which introduce them, and run thus: *Whereby in the Corruption of Manners, the true Boundaries of the Law of Nature, which ought to be the Rule of Vertue and Vice, were pretty well preſerved: So that even the Exhortations of inſpired Teachers*, &c. By which Words, and the reſt of that Section, it is plain, that I brought that Paſſage of St. *Paul* not to prove, that the general Meaſure of what Men call *Vertue* and *Vice*, throughout the World, was the Reputation and Faſhion of each particular Society within it ſelf; but to ſhew, that though it were ſo, yet, for Reaſons I there give, Men, in that way of denominating their Actions, did not, for the moſt part, much vary from the Law of Nature, which is that ſtanding and unalterable Rule, by which they ought to judge of the moral Rectitude and Pravity of their Actions, and accordingly denominate them *Vertues* or *Vices*. Had Mr. *Lowde* conſidered this, he would have found it little to his Purpoſe, to have quoted that Paſſage in a Senſe I uſed it not; and would, I imagine, have ſpared the Explication he ſubjoins to it, as not very neceſſary. But I hope this ſecond Edition will give him Satisfaction in the Point, and that this Matter is now ſo expreſſed, as to ſhew him there was no Cauſe of Scruple.

Though I am forced to differ from him in thoſe Apprehenſions he has expreſſed in the latter End of his Preface, concerning what I had ſaid about *Vertue* and *Vice*; yet we are better agreed than he thinks, in what he ſays in his third Chapter, p. 78, concerning *natural Inſcription*, and *innate Notions*.

where. For since nothing can be more natural, than to encourage with Esteem and Reputation that, wherein every one finds his Advantage; and to blame and discountenance the contrary; 'tis no wonder, that Esteem and Discredit, Vertue and Vice, should in a great Measure every-where correspond with the unchangeable Rule of Right and Wrong, which the Law of God hath established; there being nothing that so directly and visibly secures and advances the general Good of Mankind in this World, as Obedience to the Laws he has set them, and nothing that breeds such Mischiefs and Confusion, as the Neglect

---

*tions.* I shall not deny him the Privilege he claims p. 52. to state the Question as he pleases, especially when he states it so, as to leave nothing in it contrary to what I have said: For according to him, *innate Notions being conditional Things, depending upon the Concurrence of several other Circumstances, in order to the Soul's exerting them,* all that he says for *innate, imprinted, impressed Notions,* (for of *innate Ideas* he says nothing at all) amounts at last only to this; That there are certain Propositions, which tho' the Soul from the Beginning, or when a Man is born, does not know, yet by *Assistance from the outward Senses, and the help of some previous Cultivation,* it may afterwards come certainly to know the Truth of; which is no more than what I have affirm'd in my first Book. For I suppose by the *Soul's* exerting them, he means its beginning to know them, or else the *Soul's exerting of Notions,* will be to me a very unintelligible Expression; and I think at best is a very unfit one in this Case, it misleading Mens Thoughts by an Insinuation, as if these Notions were in the Mind before the *Soul exerts them,* i. e. before they are known; whereas truly before they are known, there is nothing of them in the Mind, but a Capacity to know them, when the *Concurrence of those Circumstances,* which this ingenious Author thinks necessary, *in order to the Soul's exerting them,* bring them into our Knowledge.

P. 52. I find him express it thus; *These natural Notions are not so imprinted upon the Soul, as that they naturally and necessarily exert themselves (even in Children and Ideots) without any Assistance from the outward Senses, or without the Help of some previous Cultivation.* Here he says, *they exert themselves,* as P. 78. that the *Soul exerts them.* When he has explain'd to himself or others, what he means by the *Soul's exerting innate Notions,* or *their exerting themselves,* and what that *previous Cultivation* and *Circumstances, in order* to their being *exerted,* are, he will, I suppose, find there is so little of Controversy between him and me in the Point, bating that he call's that *exerting of Notions,* which I in a more vulgar Stile call *knowing,* that I have Reason to think he brought in my Name upon this Occasion only, out of the Pleasure he has to speak civilly of me, which I must gratefully acknowledge he has done every-where he mentions me, not without conferring on me, as some others have done, a Title I have no Right to.

of them. And therefore Men, without renouncing all Sense and Reason, and their own Interest, which they are so constantly true to, could not generally mistake in placing their Commendation and Blame on that side that really deserved it not. Nay, even those Men, whose Practice was otherwise, failed not to give their Approbation right, few being depraved to that Degree as not to condemn, at least in others, the Faults they themselves were guilty of: Whereby even in the Corruption of Manners, the true Boundaries of the Law of Nature, which ought to be the Rule of Vertue and Vice, were pretty well preserved. So that even the Exhortations of inspired Teachers have not feared to appeal to common Repute. *Whatsoever is lovely, whatsoever is of good report, if there be any Vertue, if there be any Praise,* &c. Phil. 4. 8.

*Its Inforcement, Commendation, and Disrepute.*

§. 12. If any one shall imagine, that I have forgot my own Notion of a Law, when I make *the Law*, whereby Men judge *of Vertue and Vice*, to be nothing else, but the Consent of private Men, who have not Authority enough to make a Law: Especially wanting that, which is so necessary and essential to a Law, a Power to inforce it: I think, I may say, that he, who imagines Commendation and Disgrace, not to be strong Motives on Men, to accommodate themselves to the Opinions and Rules of those, with whom they converse, seems little skill'd in the Nature, or History of Mankind: The greatest part whereof he shall find to govern themselves chiefly, if not solely, by this Law of Fashion; and so they do that which keeps them in Reputation with their Company, little regard the Laws of God, or the Magistrate. The Penalties that attend the Breach of God's Laws, some, nay, perhaps, most Men seldom seriously reflect on; and amongst those that do, many, whilst they break the Law, entertain Thoughts of future Reconciliation, and making their Peace for such Breaches: And as to the Punishments due from the Laws of the Commonwealth, they frequently flatter themselves with the Hope of Impunity. But no Man 'scapes the Punishment of their Censure and Dislike, who offends against the Fashion and Opinion of the Company he keeps, and would recommend himself to. Nor is there one of ten thousand, who is stiff and insensible enough to bear up under the constant Dislike and Condemnation of his own Club. He must be of a strange and unusual Constitution, who can content himself to live in constant Disgrace and Disrepute with his own particular Society. Solitude many Men have sought, and

been

been reconciled to: But no Body, that has the leaſt Thought or Senſe of a Man about him, can live in Society under the conſtant Diſlike and ill Opinion of his Familiars, and thoſe he converſes with. Thus is a Burthen too heavy for Human Sufferance: And he muſt be made up of irreconcilable Contradictions, who can take Pleaſure in Company, and yet be inſenſible of Contempt and Diſgrace from his Companions.

*These three Laws the Rules of Moral Good and Evil.*

§. 13. Theſe three then, *Firſt*, The Law of God. *Secondly*, The Law of politick Societies. *Thirdly*, The Law of Faſhion, or private Cenſure, are thoſe to which Men variouſly compare their Actions: And 'tis by their Conformity to one of theſe Laws, that they take their Meaſures, when they would judge of their Moral Rectitude, and denominate their Actions good or bad.

*Morality is the Relation of Actions to theſe Rules.*

§. 14. Whether the Rule, to which, as to a Touch-ſtone, we bring our voluntary Actions, to examine them by, and try their Goodneſs, and accordingly to name them; which is, as it were, the Mark of the Value we ſet upon them: Whether, I ſay, we take that Rule from the Faſhion of the Country, or the Will or a Law-maker, the Mind is eaſily able to obſerve the Relation any Action hath to it; and to judge, whether the Action agrees, or diſagrees with the Rule; and ſo hath a Notion of *Moral Goodneſs or Evil*, which is either Conformity, or not Conformity of any Action to that Rule: And therefore is often called Moral Rectitude. This Rule being nothing but a Collection of ſeveral ſimple *Ideas*, the Conformity thereto is but ſo ordering the Action, that the ſimple *Ideas*, belonging to it, may correſpond to thoſe which the Law requires. And thus we ſee how Moral Beings and Notions are founded on, and terminated in theſe ſimple *Ideas* we have received from Senſation or Reflection. For Example, let us conſider the complex *Idea* we ſignify by the Word Murther; and when we have taken it aſunder, and examined all the Particulars, we ſhall find them to amount to a Collection of ſimple *Ideas* derived from Reflection or Senſation, *viz.* *Firſt*, From Reflection on the Operations of our own Minds, we have the *Ideas* of Willing, Conſidering, Purpoſing before-hand, Malice, or wiſhing Ill to another; and alſo of Life, or Perception, and Self-motion. *Secondly*, From Senſation, we have the Collection of thoſe ſimple ſenſible *Ideas* which are to be found in a Man, and of ſome Action, whereby we put an End to Perception and Motion

Motion in the Man; all which simple *Ideas*, are comprehended in the Word Murther. This Collection of simple *Ideas* being found by me to agree or disagree with the Esteem of the Country I have been bred in, and to be held by most Men there, worthy Praise or Blame, I call the Action Vertuous or Vitious: If I have the Will of a supreme, invisible Law-maker for my Rule; then, as I supposed the Action commanded or forbidden by God, I call it Good or Evil, Sin or Duty: And if I compare it to the Civil Law, the Rule made by the Legislative of the Country, I call it Lawful, or Unlawful, a Crime, or no Crime. So that whence-soever we take the Rule of Moral Actions, or by what Standard soever we frame in our Minds the *Ideas* of Vertues or Vices, they consist only, and are made up of Collections of simple *Ideas*, which we originally received from Sense or Reflection, and their Rectitude or Obliquity consists in the Agreement or Disagreement with those Patterns prescribed by some Law.

§. 15. To conceive rightly of *Moral Actions*, we must take Notice of them under this two-fold Consideration. *First*, As they are in themselves each made up of such a Collection of simple *Ideas*. Thus *Drunkenness* or *Lying* signify such or such a Collection of simple *Ideas*, which I call mixed Modes: And in this Sense, they are as much *positive absolute Ideas*, as the drinking of a Horse, or speaking of a Parrot. *Secondly*, Our Actions are considered as good, bad, *or* indifferent; and in this Respect, they are *Relative*, it being their Conformity to, or Disagreement with some Rule that makes them to be regular or irregular, good or bad: And so, as far as they are compared with a Rule, and thereupon denominated, they come under Relation. Thus the challenging and fighting with a Man, as it is a certain positive Mode, or particular sort of Action, by particular *Ideas*, distinguished from all others, is called *Duelling*: Which, when considered in Relation to the Law of God; will deserve the Name Sin; to the Law of Fashion, in some Countries, Valour and Vertue; and to the municipal Laws of some Governments, a capital Crime. In this Case, when the positive Mode has one Name, and another Name as it stands in Relation to the Law, the Distinction may as easily be observed, as it is in Substances, where one Name, *v. g. Man*, is used to signify the thing, another, *v. g. Father*, to signify the Relation.

*The Denomination of Actions often mislead us.*

§. 16. But because very frequently the positive *Idea* of the Action, and its Moral Relation, are comprehended together under one Name, and the same Word made use of to express both the Mode

or

or Action, and its Moral Rectitude or Obliquity; therefore the Relation it self is less taken notice of; and there is often no *Distinction* made *between the positive Idea* of the Action, *and the Reference it has to a Rule.* By which Confusion of these two distinct Considerations under one Term, those who yield too easily to the Impressions of Sounds, and are forward to take Names for Things, are often misled in their Judgment of Actions. Thus the taking from another what is his, without his Knowledge or Allowance, is properly called *Stealing*: But that Name being commonly understood to signify also the Moral Pravity of the Action, and to denote its Contrariety to the Law, Men are apt to condemn whatever they hear called Stealing, as an ill Action, disagreeing with the Rule of Right. And yet the Private taking away this Sword from a Mad-man, to prevent his doing Mischief, though it be properly denominated *Stealing*, as the Name of such a *mixed Mode*; yet when compared to the Law of God, and considered in its Relation to that supreme Rule, it is no Sin or Transgression, though the Name *Stealing* ordinarily carries such an Intimation with it.

*Relations innumerable.*

§. 17. And thus much for the Relation of Human Actions to a Law, which therefore I call *Moral Relations.*

'Twould make a Volume to go over all sorts of *Relations*: 'Tis not therefore to be expected, that I should here mention them all. It suffices to our present Purpose, to shew by these, what the *Ideas* are we have *of* this comprehensive Consideration, call'd *Relation*: Which is so *various*, and the Occasions of it so *many*, (as many as there can be of comparing things one to another,) that it is not very easy to reduce it to Rules, or under just Heads. Those I have mentioned, I think, are some of the most considerable, and such, as may serve to let us see from whence we get our *Ideas* of Relations, and wherein they are founded. But before I quit this Argument, from what has been said, give me leave to observe,

*All Relations terminate in simple Ideas.*

§. 18. *First*, That it is evident, that *all Relation terminates in*, and is ultimately founded on those *simple Ideas* we have *got from Sensation or Reflection*: So that all that we have in our Thoughts our selves, (if we think of any thing, or have any Meaning,) or would signify to others, when we use Words standing for Relations, is nothing but some simple *Ideas*, or Collections of simple *Ideas*, compared one with another. This is so manifest in that sort called *Proportional*, that nothing can be more. For

when

when a Man says, Honey is sweeter than Wax, it is plain that his Thoughts in this Relation, terminate in this simple *Idea*, Sweetness, which is equally true of all the rest; though, where they are compounded, or decompounded, the simple *Ideas* they are made up of, are, perhaps, seldom taken notice of; *v. g.* when the Word Farther is mentioned: *First*, There is meant that particular Species, or collective *Idea*, signified by the Word Man. *Secondly*, Those sensible simple *Ideas*, signified by the Word Generation: And, *Thirdly*, The Effects of it, and all the simple *Ideas* signified by the Word Child. So the Word Friend, being taken for a Man, who loves, and is ready to do good to another, has all those following *Ideas* to the making of it up. *First*, all the simple *Ideas*, comprehended in the Word Man, or intelligent Being. *Secondly*, The *Idea* of Love. *Thirdly*, The *Idea* of Readiness, or Disposition. *Fourthly*, The *Idea* of Action, which is any kind of Thought of Motion. *Fifthly*, The *Idea* of Good, which signifies any thing that may advance his Happiness; and terminates at last, if examined, in particular simple *Ideas*, of which the Word *Good* in general, signifies any one, but it removed from all simple *Ideas* quite, it signifies nothing at all. And thus also all Moral Words terminate at last, though, perhaps, more remotely, in a Collection of simple *Ideas*: The immediate Signification of Relative Words, being very often other supposed known Relations; which, if traced one to another, still end in simple *Ideas*.

*We have ordinarily as clear (or clearer) Notion of the Relation, as of its Foundation.*

§. 19. *Secondly*, That in Relations, we have for the most part, if not always, *as clear a Notion for the Relation, as we have of those simple* Ideas, *wherein it is founded*: Agreement or Disagreement, whereon Relation depends, being Things, whereof we have commonly as clear *Ideas*, as of any other whatsoever; it being but the distinguishing simple *Ideas*, or their Degrees one from another, without which we could have no distinct Knowledge at all. For if I have a clear *Idea* of Sweetness, Light, or Extention, I have too, of equal, or more, or less, of each of these: If I know what it is for one Man to be born of a Woman, *viz. Sempronia*, I know what it is for another Man to be born of the same Woman, *Sempronia*; and so have as clear a Notion of Brothers, as of Births, and, perhaps, clearer. For if I believed, that *Sempronia* digged *Titus* out of the Parsly-Bed, (as they use to tell Children) and thereby became his Mother; and that afterwards in the same manner, she digged *Cajus* out of the Parsly-Bed,

Bed, I had has clear a Notion of the Relation of Brothers between them, as if I had all the Skill of a Midwife; the Notion that the same Woman contributed, as Mother, equally to their Births, (though I were ignorant or mistaken in the manner of it) being that on which I grounded the Relation; and that they agreed in that Circumstance of Birth, let it be what it will. The comparing them then in their Descent from the same Person, without knowing the particular Circumstances of that Descent, is enough to found my Notion of their having or not having the Relation of Brothers. But though the *Ideas* of particular *Relations* are capable of being as clear and distinct in the Minds of those, who will duly consider them, as those of mixed Modes, and more determinate, than those of Substances; yet the Names belonging to *Relation*, are often of as doubtful and uncertain Signification, as those of Substances or mixed Modes; and much more than those of simple *Ideas*. Because Relative Words being the Marks of this Comparison, which is made only by Mens Thoughts, and is an *Idea* only in Mens Minds, Men frequently apply them to different Comparisons of Things, according to their own Imaginations, which do not always correspond with those of others using the same Names.

§. 20. *Thirdly*, That in these I call *Moral Relations*, I have a true Notion of Relation, by comparing the Action with the Rule, whether the Rule be true, or false. For if I measure any thing by a Yard, I know whether the thing I measure be longer or shorter that that supposed Yard, though, perhaps, the Yard I measure by, be not exactly the Standard: Which, indeed, is another Enquiry. For though the Rule be erroneous, and I mistaken in it; yet the Agreement or Disagreement observable in that which I compare with it, makes me perceive the Relation. Though measuring by a wrong Rule, I shall thereby be brought to judge amiss of its Moral Rectitude, because I have tried it by that which is not the true Rule; but I am not mistaken in the Relation which that Action bears to that Rule I compare it to, which is Agreement, or Disagreement.

*The Notion of the Relation is the same, whether the Rule and Action is compared to be true or false.*

CHAP.

## CHAP. XXIX.

### *Of Clear and Obscure, Distinct and Confused* Ideas.

Ideas *some clear and distinct, others obscure and confused.*

§. 1. HAving shewn the Original of our *Ideas*, and taken a View of their several sorts; considered the Difference between the simple and the complex, and observed how the complex ones are divided into those of Modes, Substances and Relations; all which, I think, is necessary to be done by any one, who would acquaint himself throughly with the Progress of the Mind in its Apprehension and Knowledge of Things; it will, perhaps, be thought I have dwelt long enough upon the Examination of *Ideas*. I must, nevertheless, crave leave to offer some few other Considerations concerning them. The first is, That some are *clear*, and others *obscure*; some *distinct*, and others *confused*.

*Clear and obscure, explained by Sight.*

§. 2. The Perception of the Mind being most aptly explained by Words relating to the Sight, we shall best understand what is meant by *clear* and *obscure* in our *Ideas*, by reflecting on what we call *clear* and *obscure* in the Objects of Sight. Light being that which discovers to us visible Objects, we give the Name of *obscure* to that which is not placed in a Light sufficient to discover minutely to us the Figure and Colours, which are observable in it, and which, in a better Light, would be discernable. In like Manner our *simple Ideas* are *clear*, when they are such as the Objects themselves, from whence they were taken, did or might, in a well-ordered Sensation or Perception, present them. Whilst the Memory retains them thus, and can produce them to the Mind, when ever it has Occasion to consider them, they are *clear Ideas*. So far as they either want any thing of that original Exactness, or have lost any of their first Freshness, and are, as it were, faded or tarnished by Time, so far are they *obscure*. *Complex Ideas*, as they are made up of simple ones, so they are *clear*, when the *Ideas* that go to their Composition are clear; and the Number and Order of those simple *Ideas*, that are the Ingredients of any complex one, is determinate and certain.

§. 3.

§. 3. The *Cause* of *Obscurity* in simple *Ideas*, seems to be either dull Organs, or very slight and transient Impressions made by the Objects; or else a Weakness in the Memory not able to retain them as received. For to return again to visible Objects, to help us to apprehend this Matter: If the Organs or Faculties of Perception, like Wax over-harden'd with Cold, will not receive the Impression of the Seal, from the usual Impulse wont to imprint it; or, like Wax of a Temper too soft, will not hold it well when well imprinted; or else supposing the Wax of a Temper fit, but the Seal not applied with a sufficient Force to make a clear Impression: In any of these Cases, the Print left by the Seal, will be *obscure*. This, I suppose, needs no Application to make it plainer. *Causes of Obscurity.*

§. 4. As a *clear Idea* is that whereof the Mind has such a full and evident Perception, as it does receive from an outward Object operating duly on a well-disposed Organ, so a *distinct Idea* is that wherein the Mind perceive a Difference from all other; and a *confused Idea* is such an one, as is not sufficiently distinguishable from another, from which it ought to be different. *Distinct and confused, what.*

§. 5. If no *Idea* be *confused*, but such as is not sufficiently distinguishable from another, from which it should be different, it will be hard, may any one say, to find any where a *confused Idea*. For let any *Idea* be as it will, it can be no other but such as the Mind perceives it to be; and that very Perception sufficiently distinguishes it from all other *Ideas*, which cannot be other, *i. e.* different, without being perceived to be so. No *Idea* therefore can be undistinguishable from another, from which it ought to be different, unless you would have it different from it self: For from all other it is evidently different. *Objection.*

§. 6. To remove this Difficulty, and to help us to conceive aright what it is that makes the *Confusion* of *Ideas* are at any time chargeable with, we must consider, that Things ranked under distinct Names, are supposed different enough to be distinguished, that so each sort, by its peculiar Name, may be marked, and discoursed of a-part upon any Occasion: And there is nothing more evident, than that the greatest part of different Names are supposed to stand for different Things. Now, every *Idea* a Man has, being visibly what it is, and distinct from all other *Ideas* but it self, that which makes it *confused*, is, when *Confusion of Ideas, is in Reference to their Names.*

it

it is such, that it may as well be called by another Name, as that which it is expressed by, the Difference which keeps the Things (to be ranked under those two different Names) distinct, and makes some of them belong rather to the one, and some of them to the other of those Names, being left out, and so the Distinction, which was intended to be kept up by those different Names, is quite lost.

*Defaults which make Confusion.*

§. 7. The *Defaults which* usually *occasion* this *Confusion*, I think, are chiefly these following:

*First, complex Ideas made up of too few simple ones.*

*First*, When any complex *Idea* (for 'tis complex *Ideas* that are most liable to Confusion) is made up of *too small a Number of simple Ideas*, and such only as are common to other Things, whereby the Differences that make it, deserve a different Name, are left out. Thus he that has an *Idea* made up of barely the simple ones of a Beast with Spots, has but a confused *Idea* of a Leopard, it not being thereby sufficiently distinguished from a Lynx, and several other sorts of Beasts that are spotted. So that such an *Idea*, though it hath the peculiar Name Leopard, is not distinguishable from those designed by the Names Lynx, or Panther, and may as well come under the Name Lynx, as Leopard. How much the Custom of defining of Words by general Terms, contributes to make the *Ideas* we would express by them confused and undetermined, I leave others to consider. This is evident, that confused *Ideas* are such as render the Use of Words uncertain, and take away the Benefit of distinct Names. When the *Ideas*, for which we use different Terms, have not a Difference answerable to their distinct Names, and so cannot be distinguished by them, there it is that they are truly confused.

*Secondly*, Or *its simple ones jumbled disorderly together.*

§. 8. *Secondly*, Another Default which makes our *Ideas* confused, is, when though the Particulars that make up any *Idea*, are in Number enough; yet they are so *jumbled together*, that it is not easily discernible, whether it more belongs to the Name that is given it, than to any other. There is nothing properer to make us conceive this Confusion, than a sort of Pictures usually shewn, as surprizing Pieces of Art, wherein the Colours, as they are laid by the Pencil on the Table it self, mark out very odd and unusual Figures, and have no discernible Order in their Position. This Draught, thus made up of Parts, wherein no Symmetry nor Order appears, is, in it self, no more a confused Thing, than the Picture of a cloudy Sky; wherein

wherein though there be as little Order of Colours or Figures to be found, yet no Body thinks it a confused Picture. What is it then that makes it be thought confused, since the Want of Symmetry does not? As it is plain it does not; for another Draught made, barely in Imitation of this, could not be called confused. I answer, That which makes it be thought confused, is, the applying it to some Name, to which it does no more discernibly belong, than to some other. *V. g.* When it is said to be the Picture of a Man, or *Cæsar*, then any one with Reason counts it confused: Because it is not discernible, in that State, to belong more to the Name Man, or *Cæsar*, than to the Name Baboon, or *Pompey*; which are supposed to stand for different *Ideas* from those signified by Man, or *Cæsar*. But when a cylindrical Mirrour, placed right, hath reduced those irregular Lines on the Table into their due Order and Proportion, then the Confusion ceases, and the Eye presently sees that it is a Man, or *Cæsar*; *i. e.* that it belongs to those Names; and that it is sufficiently distinguishable for a Baboon, or *Pompey*; *i. e.* from the *Ideas* signified by those Names. Just thus it is with our *Ideas*, which are, as it were, the Pictures of Things. No one of these mental Draughts, however the Parts are put together, can be called confused, (for they are plainly discernible as they are,) till it be ranked under some ordinary Name, to which it cannot be discerned to belong, any more than it does to some other Name of an allowed different Signification.

§. 9. *Thirdly*, A third Defect that frequently gives the Name of confused to our *Ideas*, is, when any one of them is *uncertain*, *and undetermined*. Thus we may observe Men, who not forbearing to use the ordinary Words of their Language, till they have learn'd their precise Signification, change the *Idea*, they make this or that Term stand for, almost as often as they use it. He that does this, out of Uncertainty of what he should leave out, or put into his *Idea* of *Church*, or *Idolatry*, every time he thinks of either, and holds not steady to any one precise Combination of *Ideas* that makes it up, is said to have a confused *Idea* of Idolatry, or the Church: Though this be still for the same Reason that the former, *viz.* because a mutable *Idea* (if we will allow it to be one *Idea*) cannot belong to one Name, rather than another; and so loses the Distinction that distinct Names are designed for.

*Thirdly*, Or *are mutable and undetermined.*

*Confusion without Reference to Names hardly conceivable.*

§. 10. By what has been said, we may observe how much *Names*, as supposed steady Signs of Things, and by their Difference to stand for, and keep Things distinct that in themselves are different, are the *Occasion of denominating* Ideas *distinct or confused*, by a secret and unobserved Reference the Mind makes of its *Ideas* to such Names. This, perhaps, will be fuller understood, after what I say of Words, in the Third Book, has been read and considered. But without taking Notice of such a Reference of *Ideas* to distinct Names, as the Signs of distinct Things, it will be hard to say what a *confused Idea* is. And therefore when a Man designs, by any Name, a sort of Things, or any one particular Thing, distinct from all others, the complex *Idea* he annexes to that Name, is the more distinct, the more particular the *Ideas* are, and the greater and more determinate the Number and Order of them is, whereof it is made up. For the more it has of these, the more has it still of the perceivable Differences, whereby it is kept separate and distinct from all *Ideas* belonging to other Names, even those that approach nearest to it, and thereby all Confusion with them is avoided.

*Confusion concerns always two* Ideas.

§. 11. *Confusion*, making it a Difficulty to separate two Things that should be separated, *concerns always two Ideas*; and those most, which most approach one another. Whenever therefore we suspect any *Idea* to be *confused*, we must examine what other it is in Danger to be confounded with, or which it cannot easily be separated from, and that will always be found an *Idea* belonging to another Name, and so should be a different Thing from which yet it is not sufficiently distinct; being either the same with it, or making a part of it, or, at least, as properly call'd by that Name, as the other it is ranked under; and so keeps not that Difference from that other *Idea*, which the different Names import.

*Causes of Confusion.*

§. 12. This, I think, is the *Confusion* proper to *Ideas*, which still carries with it a secret Reference to Names. At least, if there be any other Confusion of *Ideas*, this is that which most of all disorders Mens Thoughts and Discourses: *Ideas*, as ranked under Names, being those that for the most part Men Reason of within themselves, and always those which they commune about, with others. And therefore where there are supposed two different *Ideas*, marked by two different Names, which are not as distin-

distinguishable as the Sounds that stand for them, there never fails to be *Confusion*; And where any *Ideas*, are distinct, as the *Ideas* of those two Sounds they are marked by, there can be between them no *Confusion*. *The Way to prevent it*, is to collect and unite into our complex *Idea*, as precisely as is possible, all those Ingredients, whereby it is differenced from others; and to them so united in a determinate Number and Order, apply steadily the same Name. But this neither accommodating Mens Ease or Vanity, or serving any Design, but that of naked Truth, which is not always the thing aimed at, such Exactness is rather to be wished, than hoped for. And since the loose Application of Names to undetermined, variable, and almost no *Ideas*, serves both to cover our own Ignorance, as well as to perplex and confound others, which goes for Learning and Superiority in Knowledge, it is no wonder that most Men should use it themselves, whilst they complain of it in others. Though, I think, no small part of the *Confusion* to be found in the Notions of Men, might by Care and Ingenuity be avoided; yet I am far from concluding it every where wilful. Some *Ideas* are so complex, and made up of so many Parts, that the Memory does not easily retain the very same precise Combination of simple *Ideas*, under one Name; much less are we able constantly to divine for what precise complex *Idea* such a Name stands in another Man's Use of it. From the first of these, follows *Confusion* in a Man's own Reasonings and Opinions within himself; from the latter, frequent *Confusion* in discoursing and arguing with others. But having more at large treated of Words, their Defects and Abuses, in the following Book, I shall here say no more of it.

*Complex* Ideas *may be distinct in one part, and confused in another.*

§. 13. Our *complex Ideas* being made up of Collections, and so Variety of simple ones *may* accordingly *be very clear and distinct in one part, and very obscure and confused in another.* In a Man who speaks of a *Chiliaedron*, or a Body of a thousand Sides, the *Idea* of the Figure may be very confused, though that of the Number be very distinct; so that he being able to discourse, and demonstrate concerning that part of his complex *Idea*, which depends upon the Number of a Thousand, he is apt to think he has a distinct *Idea* of a *Chiliaedron*; though it be plain, he has no precise *Idea* of its Figure, so as to distinguish it, by that, from one that has but 999 Sides: The not observing whereof, causes no small Error in Mens Thoughts, Confusion in their Discourses.

§. 14. He that thinks he has a distinct *Idea* of the Figure of a *Chiliaedron*, let him for Trial's-sake take another Parcel of the same uniform Matter, *viz.* Gold, or Wax, of an equal Bulk, and make it into a Figure of 999 Sides: He will, I doubt not, be able to distinguish these two *Ideas* one from another, by the Number of Sides; and reason and argue distinctly about them, whilst he keeps his Thoughts and Reasoning to that part only of these *Ideas*, which is contained in their Numbers; as that the Sides of the one could be divided into two equal Numbers; and of the other, not, *&c.* But when he goes about to distinguish them by their Figure, he will there be presently at a Loss, and not be able, I think, to frame in his Mind two *Ideas*, one of them distinct from the other, by the bare Figure of these two Pieces of Gold; as he could, if the same Parcel of Gold were made one into a Cube, the other a Figure of five Sides. In which incompleat *Ideas*, we are very apt to impose on our selves, and wrangle with others, especially where they have particular and familiar Names. For being satisfied in that part of the *Idea*, which we have clear; and the Name which is familiar to us, being applied to the whole, containing that Part also which is imperfect and obscure, we are it, in use it for that confused Part, and draw Deductions from apt to the obscure Part of its Signification, as confidently as we do from the other.

*This, if not heeded, causes Confusion in our Arguings.*

§. 15. Having frequently in our Mouths the Name *Eternity*, we are apt to think we have a positive comprehensive *Idea* of it, which is as much as to say, that there is no Part of that Duration which is not clearly contained in our *Idea*. 'Tis true, that he that thinks so, may have a clear *Idea* of Duration; he may also have a very clear *Idea* of a very great Length of Duration; he may also have a clear *Idea* of the Comparison of that great one, with still a greater: But it not being possible for him to include in his *Idea* of any Duration, let it be as great as it will, the whole Extent together of a Duration, where he supposes no End, that Part of his *Idea*, which is still beyond the Bounds of that large Duration, he represents to his own Thoughts, is very obscure and undetermined. And hence it is, that in Disputes and Reasonings concerning Eternity, or any other *Infinity*, we are apt to blunder, and involve our selves in manifest Absurdities.

*Instance in Eternity.*

§. 16.

§. 16. In Matter, we have no clear *Ideas* of the Smallness of Parts much beyond the smallest that occur to any of our Senses; and therefore when we talk of the Divisibility of Matter *in infinitum*, though we have clear *Ideas* of Division and Divisibility, and have also clear *Ideas* of Parts made out of a whole by Division; yet we have but very obscure and confused *Ideas* of Corpuscles, or minute Bodies so to be divided, when by former Divisions they are reduced to a Smallness much exceeding the Perception of any of our Senses; and so all that we have clear and distinct *Ideas* of, is of what Division in general or abstractly is, and the Relation of *Totum* and *Parts*: But of the Bulk of the Body, to be thus infinitely divided after certain Progressions, I think, we have no clear nor distinct *Idea* at all. For I ask any one, Whether taking the smallest Atom of Dust he ever saw, he has any distinct *Idea* (bating still the Number which concerns not Extension) betwixt the 100, 000, and the 1000, 000 Part of it. Or if he thinks he can refine his *Ideas* to that Degree, without losing Sight of them, let him add ten Cyphers to each of those Numbers. Such a Degree of Smallness is not unreasonable to be supposed, since a Division carried on so far, brings it no nearer the End of infinite Division, than the first Division into two Halfs does. I must confess, for my part, I have no clear distinct *Ideas* of the different Bulk or Extension of those Bodies, having but a very obscure one of either of them. So that, I think, when we talk of Division of Bodies *in infinitum*, our *Idea* of their distinct Bulks, which is the Subject and Foundation of Division, comes, after a little Progression, to be confounded, and almost lost in Obscurity. For that *Idea*, which is to represent only Bigness, must be very obscure and confused, which we cannot distinguish from one ten times as big, but only by Number; so that we have clear, distinct *Ideas*, we may say of ten and one, but no distinct *Ideas* of two such Extensions. 'Tis plain from hence, that when we talk of infinite Divisibility of Body, or Extension, our distinct and clear *Ideas* are only of Numbers: But the clear, distinct *Ideas* of Extension, after some Progress of Division, is quite lost; and of such minute Parts, we have no distinct *Ideas* at all; but it returns, as all our *Ideas* of Infinite do, at last to that of Number always to be added; but thereby never amounts to any distinct *Idea* of actual, infinite Parts. We have, 'tis true, a clear *Idea* of Division, as often as we will think of it; but thereby we have no more a clear *Idea* of infinite Parts in Matter, than we

*Divisibility of Matter.*

have a clear *Idea* of an infinite Number, by being able still to add new Numbers to any assigned Number we have: Endless Divisibility giving us no more a clear and distinct *Idea* of actually infinite Parts, than endless Addibility (if I may so speak) give us a clear and distinct *Idea* of an actually infinite Number. They both being only in a Power still of increasing the Number, be it already as great as it will. So that of what remains to be added, (wherein consists the Infinity,) we have but an obscure, imperfect, and confused *Idea*; from or about which we can argue or reason with no Certainty or Clearness, no more than we can in Arithmetick, about a Number of which we have no such distinct *Idea*, as we have of 4 or 100; but only this relative obscure one, that compared to any other, it is still bigger: And we have no more a clear, positive *Idea* of it, when we say or conceive it is bigger, or more than 400, 000, 000, than if we should say, it is bigger than 40, or 4; 400, 000, 000, having no nearer a Proportion to the End of Addition, or Number, than 4. For he that adds only 4 to 4, and so proceeds, shall as soon come to the End of all Addition, as he that adds 400, 000, 000, to 400, 000, 000. And so likewise in Eternity, he that has an *Idea* of but four Years, has as much a positive compleat *Idea* of Eternity, as he that has one of 400, 000, 000, of Years: For what remains of Eternity beyond either of these two Numbers of Years, is as clear to the one as the other; *i. e.* neither of them has any clear, positive *Idea* of it at all. For he that adds only 4 Years to 4, and so on, shall as soon reach Eternity, as he that adds 400, 000, 000 of Years, and so on; or if he please, doubles the Increase as often as he will: The remaining Abyss being still as far beyond the End of all these Progressions, as it is from the Length of a Day, or an Hour. For nothing finite bears any Proportion to infinite; and therefore our *Ideas*, which are all finite, cannot bear any. Thus it is also in our *Idea* of *Extension*, when we encrease it by Addition, as well as when we diminish it by Division, and would enlarge our Thoughts to infinite Space. After a few Doublings of those *Ideas* of Extension, which are the largest we are accustomed to have, we lose the clear distinct *Idea* of that Space: It becomes a confusedly great one, with a Surplus of still greater; about which, when we would argue or reason, we shall always find our selves at a Loss; confused *Ideas*, in our Arguings and Deductions from that part of them which is confused, always leading us into Confusion.

CHAP.

# CHAP. XXX.

## *Of Real and Fantaſtical* Ideas.

*Real* Ideas *are conformable to their Archetypes.*

§. 1. BEſides what we already mentioned concerning *Ideas*, other Conſiderations belong to them, in Reference to Things from whence they are taken, or which they may be ſuppoſed to repreſent; and thus, I think, they may come under a threefold Diſtinction; and are,

*First*, Either real, or fantaſtical.

*Secondly*, Adequate, or inadequate.

*Thirdly*, True, or falſe.

*First*, By *real Ideas*, I mean ſuch as have a Foundation in Nature; ſuch as have a Conformity with the real Being, and Exiſtence of Things, or with their Archetypes. *Fantaſtical or Chimerical*, I call ſuch as have no Foundation in Nature, nor have any Conformity with that Reality of Being, to which they are tacitly referr'd, as to their Archetypes. If we examine the ſeveral ſorts of *Ideas* before-mentioned, we ſhall find, that,

*Simple* Ideas *all real.*

§. 2. *First*, *Our ſimple* Ideas *are all real*, all agree to the Reality of Things. Not that they are all of them the Images, or Repreſentations of what does exiſt, the contrary whereof, in all but the primary Qualities of Bodies, hath been already ſhewed. But though Whiteneſs and Coldneſs are no more in Snow, than Pain is; yet thoſe *Ideas* of Whiteneſs and Coldneſs, Pain, *&c.* being in us the Effects of Powers in Things without us, ordained by our Maker, to produce in us ſuch Senſations; they are real *Ideas* in us, whereby we diſtinguiſh the Qualities that are really in Things themſelves. For theſe ſeveral Appearances being deſigned to be the Marks whereby we are to know and diſtinguiſh Things which we have to do with, our *Ideas* do as well ſerve us to that Purpoſe, and are as real diſtinguiſhing Characters, whether they be only conſtant Effects, or elſe exact Reſemblances of ſomething in the Things themſelves; the Reality lying in that ſteady Correſpondence they have with the diſtinct Conſtitutions of real Beings. But whether they anſwer to thoſe Conſtitutions, as to Cauſes or Patterns, it matters not;

it ſuffices that they are conſtantly produced by them. And thus our ſimple *Ideas* are all real and true, becauſe they anſwer and agree to thoſe Powers of Things which produce them in our Minds, that being all that is requiſite to make them real, and not Fictions at Pleaſure. For in ſimple *Ideas*, (as has been ſhewn,) the Mind is wholly confined to the Operation of Things upon it, and can make to it ſelf no ſimple *Idea*, more than what it has received.

*Complex* Ideas *are voluntary Combinations.*

§. 3. Though the Mind be wholly paſſive, in Reſpect of its ſimple *Ideas*; yet, I think, we may ſay, it is not ſo in reſpect of its complex *Ideas*: For thoſe being Combinations of ſimple *Ideas* put together, and united under one general Name; 'tis plain that the Mind of Man uſes ſome kind of Liberty, in forming thoſe complex *Ideas*: How elſe comes it to paſs, that one Man's *Idea* of Gold, or Juſtice, is different from anothers? But becauſe he has put in, or left out of his ſome ſimple *Idea* which the other has not. The Queſtion then is, Which of theſe are real, and which barely imaginary Combinations? What Collections agree to the Reality of Things, and what not? And to this, I ſay, That,

*Mixed Modes made of conſiſtent* Ideas, *are real.*

§. 4. *Secondly, Mixed Modes and Relations*, having no other *Reality* but what they have in the Minds of Men, there is nothing more required to thoſe kind of *Ideas*, to make them *real*, but that they be ſo framed, that there be a Poſſibility of exiſting conformable to them. Theſe *Ideas* being themſelves Archetypes, cannot differ from their Archetypes, and ſo *cannot be chimerical*, unleſs any one will jumble together in them inconſiſtent *Ideas*. Indeed, as any of them have the Names of a known Language aſſigned to them, by which he that has them in his Mind would ſignifie them to others, ſo bare Poſſibility of exiſting is not enough; they muſt have a Conformity to the ordinary Signification of the Name that is given them, that they may not be thought fantaſtical: As if a Man would give the Name of Juſtice to that *Idea*, which common Uſe calls Liberality. But this Fantaſticalneſs relates more to Propriety of Speech, than Reality of *Ideas*: For a Man to be undiſturbed in Danger, ſedately to conſider what is fitteſt to be done, and to execute it ſteadily, is a mixed Mode, or a complex *Idea* of an Action which may exiſt. But to be undiſturbed in Danger, without uſing ones Reaſon or Induſtry, is what is alſo poſſible to be; and ſo is as real an *Idea* as the other. Though the

the first of these having the Name *Courage* given to it, may, in Respect of that Name, be a right or wrong *Idea*: But the other, whilst it has not a common received Name of any known Language assigned to it, is not capable of any Deformity, being made with no Reference to any thing but it self.

§. 5. *Thirdly*, Our *complex* Ideas *of Substances* being made all of them in Reference to Things existing without us, and intended to be Representations of Substances, as they really are, are no farther *real*, than as they are such Combinations of simple *Ideas*, as are really united, and co-exist in Things without us. On the contrary, those are *fantastical*, which are made up of such Collections of simple *Ideas* as were really never united, never were found together in any Substance; *v. g.* a rational Creature, consisting of a Horse's Head, joined to a Body of Human Shape, or such as the *Centaurs* are described: Or, a Body yellow, very malleable, fusible, and fixed; but lighter than common Water: Or, an uniform, unorganized Body, consisting, as to Sense, all of similar Parts, with Perception and voluntary Motion joined to it. Whether such Substances as these can possibly exist, or no, 'tis probable we do not know: But be that as it will, these *Ideas* of Substances being made conformable to no Pattern existing that we know, and consisting of such Collections of *Ideas*, as no Substance ever shewed us united together, they ought to pass with us for barely imaginary: But much more are those complex *Ideas* so, which contain in them any Inconsistency or Contradiction of their Parts.

*Ideas of Substances are real, when they agree with the Existence of Things.*

---

# CHAP. XXXI.

## *Of Adequate and Inadequate* Ideas.

§. 1. OF our real *Ideas*, some are adequate, and some are inadequate. Those I call *adequate*, which perfectly represent those Archetypes which the Mind supposes them taken from; which it intends them to stand for, and to which it refers them. *Inadequate Ideas* are such, which are but a partial, or incompleat

*Adequate Ideas, are such as perfectly represent their Archetypes.*

Represen-

Repreſentation of thoſe Archetypes to which they are referred. Upon which account it is plain,

§. 2. *First*, That *all our ſimple* Ideas *are adequate.*

*Simple* Ideas *all adequate.* Becauſe being nothing but the Effects of certain Powers in Things, fitted and ordained by GOD, to produce ſuch Senſations in us, they cannot but be correſpondent and adequate to thoſe Powers: And we are ſure they agree to the Reality of Things. For if Sugar produce in us the *Ideas* which we call Whiteneſs, and Sweetneſs, we are ſure there is a Power in Sugar to produce thoſe *Ideas* in our Minds, or elſe they could not have been produced by it. And ſo each Senſation anſwering the Power that operates on any of our Senſes, the *Idea* ſo produced, is a real *Idea*, (and not a Fiction of the Mind, which has no Power to produce any ſimple *Idea*;) and cannot but be adequate, ſince it ought only to anſwer that Power: And ſo all ſimple *Ideas* are adequate. 'Tis true, the Things producing in us theſe ſimple *Ideas*, are but few of them denominated by us, as if they were only the Cauſes of them; but as if thoſe *Ideas* were real Beings in them. For though Fire be called painful to the Touch, whereby is ſignified the Power of producing in us the *Idea* of Pain; yet it is denominated alſo Light, and Hot; as if Light and Heat, were really ſomething in the Fire, more than a Power to excite theſe *Ideas* in us; and therefore are called *Qualities* in, or of the Fire. But theſe being nothing, in Truth, but Powers to excite ſuch *Ideas* in us, I muſt, in that Senſe, be underſtood, when I ſpeak of ſecondary *Qualities*, as being in Things; or of their *Ideas*, as being in the Objects that excite them in us. Such ways of ſpeaking, though accommodated to the vulgar Notions, without which one cannot be well underſtood; yet truly ſignify nothing, but thoſe Powers which are in Things, to excite certain Senſations or *Ideas* in us. Since were there no fit Organs to receive the Impreſſions Fire makes on the Sight and Touch; nor a Mind joined to thoſe Organs to receive the *Ideas* of Light and Heat, by thoſe Impreſſions from the Fire, or the Sun, there would yet be no more Light or Heat in the World, than there would be Pain, if there were no ſenſible Creature to feel it, though the Sun ſhould continue juſt as it is now, and Mount *Ætna* flame higher than ever it did. Solidity, and Extenſion, and the Termination of it, Figure, with Motion and Reſt, whereof we have the *Ideas*, would be really in the World as they are, whether there were any ſenſible Being to perceive them, or no: And therefore thoſe we have Reaſon to look on, as the real

Modifi-

Modifications of Matter; and such as are the exciting Causes of all our various Sensations from Bodies. But this being an Enquiry not belonging to this Place, I shall enter no farther into it, but proceed to shew, what complex *Ideas* are *adequate*, and what not.

*Modes are all adequate.*

§. 3. *Secondly*, Our *complex* Ideas *of Modes*, being voluntary Collections of simple *Ideas*, which the Mind puts together, without reference to any real Archetypes, or standing Patterns, existing any where, *are* and cannot but be *adequate Ideas*. Because they not being intended for Copies of Things really existing, but for Archetypes made by the Mind, to rank and denominate Things by, cannot want any thing; they having each of them that Combination of *Ideas*, and thereby that Perfection which the Mind intended they should: So that the Mind acquiesces in them, and can find nothing wanting. Thus by having the *Idea* of a Figure, with three sides meeting at three Angles, I have a compleat *Idea*, wherein I require nothing else to make it perfect. That the Mind is satisfied with the Perfection of this its *Idea*, is plain in that it does not conceive, that any Understanding hath, or can have a more compleat or perfect *Idea* of that thing it signifies by the Word *Triangle*, supposing it to exist, than it self has in that complex *Idea* of three Sides, and three Angles; in which is contained all that *is*, or can be essential to it, or necessary to compleat it, wherever or however it exists. But in our *Ideas* of *Substances*, it is otherwise. For their desiring to copy Things as they really do exist, and represent to our selves that Constitution on which all their Properties depend, we perceive our *Ideas* attain not that Perfection we intend: We find they still want something we should be glad were in them; and so are all *inadequate*. But *mixed Modes*, and *Relations*, being Archetypes without Patterns, and so having nothing to represent but themselves, cannot but be adequate, every thing being so to it self. He that at first put together the *Idea* of Danger perceived, Absence of Disorder from Fear, sedate Consideration of what was justly to be done, and executing of that without Disturbance, or being deterred by the Danger of it, had certainly in his Mind that complex *Idea* made up of that Combination, and intending it to be nothing else, but what it is; nor to have in it any other simple *Ideas*, but what it hath, it could not also but be an *adequate Idea*: And laying this up in his Memory, with the Name *Courage* annexed to it, to signifie it to others, and denominate from thence any Action he should observe

ſerve to agree with it, had thereby a Standard to meaſure and denominate Actions by, as they agreed to it. This *Idea* thus made, and laid up for a Pattern, muſt neceſſarily be *adequate*, being referred to nothing elſe but it ſelf, nor made by any other Original, but the Good-liking and Will of him that firſt made this Combination.

*Modes in Reference to ſettled Names, may be inadequate.*

§. 4. Indeed, another coming after, and in Converſation learning from him the Word *Courage*, may make an *Idea*, to which he gives that Name *Courage*, different from what the firſt Author applied it to, and has in his Mind, when he uſes it. And in this Caſe, if he deſigns, that his *Idea* in Thinking, ſhould be conformable to the other's *Idea*, as the Name he uſes in Speaking is conformable in Sound to his, from whom he learned it, his *Idea* may be very wrong and *inadequate*. Becauſe in this Caſe, making the other Man's *Idea* the Pattern of his *Idea* in thinking, as the other Man's Word, or Sound, is the Pattern of his in Speaking, his *Idea* is ſo far defective and *inadequate*, as it is diſtant from the Archetype and Pattern he refers it to, and intend to expreſs and ſignify by the Name he uſes for it; which Name he would have to be a Sign of the other Man's *Idea*, (to which, in its proper Uſe, it is primarily annexed,) and of his own, as agreeing to it: To which, if his own does not exactly correſpond, it is faulty and inadequate.

§. 5. Therefore theſe *complex* Ideas *of Modes*, when they are referred by the Mind, and intended to correſpond to the *Ideas* in the Mind of ſome other intelligent Being, expreſſed by the Names we apply to them, they *may be* very deficient, wrong, and *inadequate*. Becauſe they agree not to that, which the Mind deſigns to be their Archetype and Pattern: In which reſpect only, any *Idea* of *Mode* can be wrong, imperfect, or *inadequate*. And on this account, our *Ideas* of *mixed Modes* are the moſt liable to be faulty of any other; but this refers more to proper Speaking, than knowing Right.

*Ideas of Subſtances, as refer'd to real Eſſences, not adequate.*

§. 6. *Thirdly*, What *Ideas we have of Subſtances*, I have above ſhewed: Now, thoſe *Ideas* have in the Mind a double Reference: 1. Sometimes they are referred to a ſuppoſed real Eſſence of each Species of Things. 2. Sometimes they are only deſign'd to be Pictures and Repreſentations in the Mind of Things that do exiſt by *Ideas* of thoſe Qualities that are diſcoverable in them. In both which ways,

theſe

these Copies of those Originals and Archetypes, *are* imperfect and *inadequate*.

*First*, It is usual for Men to make the Names of Substances, stand for Things, as supposed to have certain real Essences, whereby they are of this or that Species: And Names standing for nothing but the *Ideas* that are in Mens Minds, they must consequently refer their *Ideas* to such real Essences, as to their Archetypes. That Men (especially such as have been bred up in the Learning taught in this part of the World) do suppose certain specifick Essences of Substances, which each Individual, in its several kinds, is made conformable to, and partakes of, is so far from needing Proof, that it will be thought strange, if any one should do otherwise. And thus they ordinarily apply the specifick Names they rank particular Substances under, to Things, as distinguished by such specifick real Essences. Who is there almost, who would not take it amiss, if it should be doubted, whether he called himself Man, with any other Meaning, than as having the real Essence of a Man? And yet if you demand, what those real Essences are, 'tis plain Men are ignorant, and know them not. From whence it follows, that the *Ideas* they have in their Minds, being referred to real Essences, as to Archetypes which are unknown, must be so far from being *adequate*, that they cannot be supposed to be any Representation of them at all. The complex *Ideas* we have of Substances, are, as it has been shewn, certain Collections of simple *Ideas* that have been observed or supposed constantly to exist together. But such a complex *Idea* cannot be the real Essence of any Substance; for then the Properties we discover in that Body, would depend on that complex *Idea*, and be deducible from it, and their necessary Connexion with it be known; as all Properties of a Triangle depend on, and as far as they are discoverable, are deducible from the complex *Idea* of three Lines, including a Space. But it is plain, that in our complex *Ideas* of Substances, are not contained such *Ideas*, on which all the other Qualities, that are to be found in them, do depend. The common *Idea* Men have of *Iron*, is a Body of a certain Colour, Weight, and Hardness; and a Property that they look on as belonging to it, is Malleableness. But yet this Property has no necessary Connexion with that complex *Idea*, or any part of it: And there is no more Reason to think, that Malleableness depends on that Colour, Weight, and Hardness, than that that Colour, or that Weight depends on its Malleableness. And yet, though we know nothing of these real Essences, there is

nothing

nothing more ordinary, than that Men ſhould attribute the ſorts of Things to ſuch Eſſences. The particular parcel of Matter, which makes the Ring I have on my Finger, is forwardly, by moſt Men, ſuppoſed to have a real Eſſence, whereby it is *Gold*; and from whence thoſe Qualities flow, which I find in it, *viz.* its peculiar Colour, Weight, Hardneſs, Fuſibility, Fixedneſs, and change of Colour upon a ſlight touch of Mercury, *&c.* This Eſſence, from which all theſe Properties flow, when I enquire into it, and ſearch after it, I plainly perceive I cannot diſcover: The fartheſt I can go, is only to preſume, that it being nothing but Body, its real Eſſence, or internal Conſtitution, on which theſe Qualities depend, can be nothing but the Figure, Size, and Connexion of its ſolid Parts; of neither of which, I having any diſtinct Perception at all, I can have no *Idea* of its Eſſence, which is the Cauſe that it has that particular ſhining Yellowneſs, a greater Weight than any thing I know of the ſame Bulk, and a Fitneſs to have its Colour changed by the touch of Quickſilver. If any one will ſay, that the real Eſſence, and internal Conſtitution, on which theſe Properties depend, is not the Figure, Size, and Arangement or Connexion of its ſolid Parts, but ſomething elſe, call'd its particular *Form*; I am farther from having any *Idea* of its real Eſſence, than I was before; for I have an *Idea* of Figure, Size, and Situation of ſolid Parts in general, tho' I have none of the particular Figure, Size, or putting together of Parts, whereby the Qualities above-mentioned are produced; which Qualities I find in that particular parcel of Matter that is on my Finger, and not in another parcel of Matter, with which I cut the Pen I write with. But when I am told, that ſomething beſides the Figure, Size, and Poſture of the ſolid Parts of that Body, is its Eſſence, ſomething called *ſubſtantial Form*; of that, I confeſs, I have no *Idea* at all, but only of the ſound *Form*; which is far enough from an *Idea* of its real Eſſence, or Conſtitution. The like Ignorance as I have of the real Eſſence of this particular Subſtance, I have alſo of the real Eſſence of all other natural ones: Of which Eſſences, I confeſs, I have no diſtinct *Ideas* at all; and I am apt to ſuppoſe others, when they examine their own Knowledge, will find in themſelves, in this one Point, the ſame ſort of Ignorance.

§. 7. Now then, when Men apply this particular parcel of Matter in my Finger, a general Name already in Uſe, and denominate it *Gold*, do they not ordinarily, or are they not underſtood to give it that Name as belonging to a particular Species

of

of Bodies, having a real internal Essence; by having of which Essence, this particular Substance comes to be of that Species, and to be called by that Name? If it be so, as it is plain it is, the Name, by which Things are marked, as having that Essence, must be referred primarily to that Essence; and consequently the *Idea* to which that Name is given, must be referred also to that Essence, and be intended to represent it. Which Essence, since they, who so use the Names, know not, their Ideas *of Substances* must be *all inadequate* in that Respect, as not containing in them that real Essence which the Mind intends they should.

*Ideas of Substances, as Collections of their Qualities, are all inadequate.*

§. 8. *Secondly*, Those who neglecting that useless Supposition of unknown real Essences, whereby they are distinguished, endeavour to copy the Substances that exist in the World, by putting together the *Ideas* of those sensible Qualities which are found co-existing in them, though they come much nearer a Likeness of them, than those who imagine they know not what real specifick Essences: Yet they arrive not at perfectly adequate *Ideas* of those Substances they would thus copy into their Minds; nor do those Copies exactly and fully contain all that is to be found in their Archetypes. Because those Qualities, and Powers of Substances, whereof we make their complex *Ideas*, are so many and various, that no Man's complex *Idea* contains them all. That our abstract *Ideas* of Substances, do not contain in them all the simple *Ideas* that are united in the things themselves, is evident, in that Men do rarely put into their complex *Idea* of any Substance, all the simple *Ideas* they do know to exist in it. Because endeavouring to make the Signification of their specifick Names as clear, and as little cumbersome as they can, they make their specifick *Ideas* of the sorts of Substances, for the most part, of a few of those simple *Ideas* which are to be found in them: But these having no Original Precedency, or right to be put in, and make the specifick *Idea* more than others that are left out, 'tis plain, that both these ways, *our* Ideas *of Substances* are deficient and *inadequate*. The simple *Ideas*, whereof we make our complex ones of Substances, are all of them (bating only the Figure and Bulk of some sorts) Powers, which being Relations to other Substances, we can never be sure that we know all the Powers that are in any one Body, till we have tried what Changes it is fitted to give to, or receive from other Substances, in their several ways of Application: Which being impossible to be

tried

tried upon any one Body, much less upon all, it is impossible we should have adequate *Ideas* of any Substance, made up of a Collection of all its Properties.

§. 9. Whosoever first light on a parcel of that sort of Substance we denote by the Word *Gold*, could not rationally take the Bulk and Figure he observed in that Lump, to depend on its real Essence or internal Constitution. Therefore those never went into his *Idea* of that Species of Body; but its peculiar Colour, perhaps, and Weight, were the first he abstracted from it, to make the complex *Idea* of that Species. Which both are but Powers; the one to affect our Eyes after such a manner, and to produce in us that *Idea* we call Yellow; and the other to force upwards any other Body of equal Bulk, they being put into a pair of equal Scales, one against another. Another, perhaps, added to these, the *Ideas* of Fusibility and Fixedness, two other passive Powers, in Relation to the Operation of Fire upon it; another, its Ductility and Solubility in *Aq. Regia*; two other Powers, relating to the Operation of other Bodies, in changing its outward Figure or Separation of it into insensible Parts. These, or part of these, put together, usually make the complex *Idea* in Mens Minds, of that sort of Body we call *Gold*.

§. 10. But no one, who hath considered the Properties of Bodies in general, or this sort in particular, can doubt, that this, called *Gold*, has infinite other Properties, not contained in that complex *Idea*. Some, who have examined this Species more accurately, could, I believe, enumerate ten times as many Properties in *Gold*, all of them as inseparable from its internal Constitution, as its Colour, or Weight: And, 'tis probable, if any one knew all the Properties that are by divers Men known of this Metal, there would an hundred times as many *Ideas* go to the complex *Idea* of *Gold*, as any one Man yet has in his; and yet, perhaps, that not be the thousandth part of what is to be discovered in it. The Changes that that one Body is apt to receive, and make in other Bodies, upon due Application, exceeding far, not only what we know, but what we are apt to imagine. Which will not appear so much a Paradox to any one, who will but consider how far Men are yet from knowing all the Properties of that one, no very compound Figure, a *Triangle*, though it be no small Number, that are already by Mathematicians discovered of it.

§. 11.

§. 11. So that *all our complex* Ideas *of Substances, are* imperfect and *inadequate.* Which would be so also in Mathematical Figures, if we were to have our complex *Ideas* of them, only by collecting their Properties in Reference to other Figures. How uncertain and imperfect would our *Ideas* be of an *Ellipsis*, if we had no other *Idea* of it, but some few of its Properties? Whereas having in our plain *Idea*, the whole Essence of that Figure, we from thence discover those Properties, and demonstratively see how they flow, and are inseparable from it.

Ideas *of Substances, as Collections of their Qualities, are all inadequate.*

§. 12. This the Mind has three sorts of abstract *Ideas*, or nominal Essences:

*Simple* Ideas ἐκτυπα, *and adequate.*

*First*, *Simple* Ideas, which *are* ἐκτυπα, or *Copies*; but yet certainly *adequate.* Because being intended to express nothing but the Power in Things to produce in the Mind such a Sensation, that Sensation, when it is produced, cannot but be the Effect of that Power. So the Paper I write on, having the Power, in the Light, (I speak according to the common Notion of Light,) to produce in me the Sensation which I call White, it cannot but be the Effect of such a Power, in something without the Mind, since the Mind has not the Power to produce any such *Idea* in it self; and being meant for nothing else but the Effect of such a Power; that simple *Idea* is real and *adequate*: The Sensation of White, in my Mind, being the Effect of that Power, which is in the Paper to produce it, is perfectly *adequate* to that Power; or else, that Power would produce a different *Idea.*

Ideas *of Substances are* ἐκτυπα, *inadequate.*

§. 13. *Secondly*, The *complex* Ideas *of Substances, are Ectypes, Copies* too; but not perfect ones, not *adequate*: Which is very evident to the Mind, in that it plainly perceives, that whatever Collection of simple *Ideas* it makes of any Substance that exists, it cannot be sure, that it exactly answers all that are in that Substance: Since not having tried all the Operations of all other Substances upon it, and found all the Alterations it would receive from, or cause in other Substances, it cannot have an exact *adequate* Collection of all its active and passive Capacities; and so *not* have an *adequate* complex *Idea* of the Powers of any Substance existing, and its Relations, which its that sort of complex *Idea* of Substances we have. And, after all, if we could have, and actually had, in our complex *Idea*, an exact Collection of all the secondary Qualities or Powers of any Substance, we

should not yet thereby have an *Idea* of the Essence of that Thing. For since the Powers or Qualities, that are observable by us, are not the real Essence of that Substance, but depend on it, and flow from it, any Collection whatsoever of these Qualities, cannot be the real Essence of that Thing. Whereby it is plain, that our *Ideas* of Substances are not *adequate*; are not what the Mind intends them to be. Besides, a Man has no *Idea* of Substance in general, nor knows what Substance is in it self.

*Ideas of Modes and Relations, are Archetypes, and cannot but be adequate.*

§. 14. *Thirdly, Complex* Ideas *of Modes and Relations, are* Originals, and *Archetypes*; are not Copies, nor made after the Pattern of any real Existence, to which the Mind intends them to be conformable, and exactly to answer. These being such Collections of simple *Ideas*, that the Mind it self puts together, and such Collections, that each of them contains in it precisely all that the Mind intends it should, they are Archetypes and Essences of Modes that may exist; and so are designed only for, and belong only to such Modes, as when they do exist, have an exact Conformity with those complex *Ideas*. The *Ideas* therefore of Modes and Relations, cannot but be *adequate*.

---

# CHAP. XXXII.

## *Of True and False* Ideas.

*Truth and Falshood properly belong to Propositions.*

§. 1. THough Truth and Falshood belong, in Propriety of Speech, only to Propositions; yet *Ideas* are oftentimes termed *true* or *false*, (as what Words are there not used with great Latitude, and with some Deviation from their strict and proper Significations? ) Though, I think, that when *Ideas* themselves are termed true or false, there is still some secret or tacit Proposition, which is the Foundation of that Denomination: As we shall see, if we examine the particular Occasions, wherein they come to be called true or false. In all which, we shall find some kind of Affirmation, or Negation, which is the Reason of that Denomination. For our *Ideas*, being nothing but bare Appearances or Perceptions in our Minds,

Minds, cannot properly and simply in themselves be said to be *true* or *false*, no more than a single Name of any thing can be said to be *true* or *false*.

*Metaphysical Truth contains a tacit Proposition.*

§. 2. Indeed, both *Ideas* and Words *may* be said to be *true in a metaphysical Sense* of the Word Truth, as all other Things, that any way exist, are said to be true; *i. e.* really to be such as they exist. Though in Things called *true*, even in that Sense, there is, perhaps, a secret Reference to our *Ideas*, look'd upon as the Standards of that Truth, which amounts to a mental Proposition, though it be usually not taken notice of.

*No* Idea, *as an Appearance in the Mind, true or false.*

§. 3. But 'tis not in that metaphysical Sense of Truth, which we enquire here, when we examine, whether our *Ideas* are capable of being *true* or *false*; but in the more ordinary Acceptation of those Words: And so I say, that the *Ideas* in our Minds, being only so many Perceptions, or Appearances there, none of them are *false*. The *Idea* of a Centaur having no more Falshood in it, when it appears in our Minds, than the Name Centaur has Falshood in it, when it is pronounced by our Mouths, or written on Paper. For Truth or Falshood, lying always in some Affirmation, or Negation, Mental or Verbal, our *Ideas* are *not capable*, any of them, *of being false*, till the Mind passes some Judgment on them; that is, affirms or denies something of them.

Ideas *referred to any thing, may be true or false.*

§. 4. Whenever the Mind refers any of its *Ideas* to any thing extraneous to them, they are then *capable to be called true or false*. Because the Mind in such a Reference, makes a tacit Supposition of their Conformity to that Thing: Which Supposition, as it happens to be *true* or *false*; so the *Ideas* themselves come to be denominated. The most usual Cases wherein this happens, are these following:

*Other Mens* Ideas, *real Existence and supposed real Essences, are what Men usually refer* Ideas *to.*

§. 5. *First*, When the Mind supposes any *Idea* it has, *conformable to* that in *other Mens* Minds, called by the same common Name; *v. g.* when the Mind intends or judges its *Ideas* of *Justice*, *Temperance*, *Religion*, to be the same with what other Men give those Names to.

*Secondly*, When the Mind supposes any *Idea* it has in it self, to be *conformable to some real Existence*. Thus the two *Ideas*, of a Man, and a Centaur, supposed to be the *Ideas* of real Substances, are the one *true*, and

the other *false*; the one having a Conformity to what has really existed, the other not.

*Thirdly*, When the Mind *refers* any of its *Ideas to* that *real* Constitution, and *Essence* of any thing, whereon all its Properties depend: And thus the greatest part, if not all our *Ideas* of Substances, are *false*.

*The Cause of such References.*

§. 6. These Suppositions, the Mind is very apt tacitly to make concerning its own *Ideas*. But yet, if we will examine it, we shall find it is chiefly, if not only, concerning its abstract complex *Ideas*. For the natural Tendency of the Mind being towards Knowledge; and finding that, if it should proceed by, and dwell upon only particular Things, its Progress would be very slow, and its Work endless: Therefore to shorten its way to Knowledge, and make each Perception the more comprehensive; the first Thing it does, as the Foundation of the easier enlarging its Knowledge, either by Contemplation of the Things themselves, that it would know, or Conference with others about them, is to bind them into Bundles, and rank them so into Sorts, that what Knowledge it gets of any of them, it may thereby with Assurance extend to all of that sort; and so advance by larger Steps in that, which is its great Business, Knowledge. This, as I have elsewhere shewed, is the Reason why we collect Things under comprehensive *Ideas*, with Names annexed to them, into *Genera* and *Species*, *i. e.* into Kinds and Sorts.

§. 7. If therefore we will warily attend to the Motions of the Mind, and observe that Course it usually takes in its Way to Knowledge, we shall, I think, find, that the Mind having got any *Idea*, which it thinks it may have Use of, either in Contemplation or Discourse, the first Thing it does, is to abstract it, and then get a Name to it; and so lay it up in its Store-house, the Memory, as containing the Essence of a sort of Things, of which that Name is always to be the Mark. Hence it is, that we may often observe, that when any one sees a new Thing of a Kind that he knows not, he presently asks what it is, meaning by that Enquiry, nothing but the Name. As if the Name carried with it the Knowledge of the Species, or the Essence of it, whereof it is indeed used as the Mark, and is generally supposed annexed to it.

*The Cause of such References.*

§. 8. But this abstract *Idea* being something in the Mind between the Thing that exists, and the Name that is given to it; it is in our *Ideas*, that both the Rightness of our Knowledge, and the Propriety or Intelligibleness of our Speaking, consists. And hence it is, that Men are so forward to suppose, that the

the abstract *Ideas* they have in their Minds, are such as agree to the Things existing without them, to which they are referr'd; and are the same also, to which the Names they give them, do, by the Use and Propriety of that Language, belong. For without this *double Conformity of* their *Ideas*, they find they should both think amiss of Things in themselves, and talk of them unintelligibly to others.

*Simple* Ideas *may be false, in Reference to others of the same Name, but are least liable to be so.*

§. 9. *First* then, I say, That *when the Truth of our* Ideas *is judged of, by the Conformity they have to the* Ideas *which other Men have, and commonly signify by the same Name, they may be any of them false.* But yet *simple* Ideas are *least* of all *liable to be so mistaken:* Because a Man by his Senses, and every Day's Observation, may easily satisfy himself what the simple *Ideas* are, which their several Names that are in common Use stand for, they being but few in Number, and such, as if he doubts or mistakes in, he may easily rectify by the Objects they are to be found in. Therefore it is seldom, that any one mistakes in his Names of simple *Ideas*; or applies the Name *Red*, to the *Idea* of Green; or the Name Sweet, to the *Idea* Bitter: Much less are Men apt to confound the Names of *Ideas*, belonging to different Senses; and call a Colour, by the Name of a Taste, *&c.* whereby it is evident, that the simple *Ideas* they call by any Name, are commonly the same that others have and mean, when they use the same Names.

Ideas *of mixed Modes most liable to be false in this Sense.*

§. 10. *Complex* Ideas *are much more liable to be false in this Respect; and the complex* Ideas *of mixed Modes, much more than those of Substances:* Because in Substances, (especially those which the common and unborrowed Names of any Language are applied to) some remarkable sensible Qualities, serving ordinarily to distinguish one sort from another, easily preserve those, who take any Care in the Use of their Words, from applying them to sorts of Substances to which they do not at all belong. But in mixed Modes, we are much more uncertain, it being not so easy to determine of several Actions, whether they are to be called *Justice*, or *Cruelty*; *Liberality*, or *Prodigality*. And so in referring our *Ideas* to those of other Men, call'd by the same Names, ours may be *false*; and the *Idea* in our Minds, which we express by the Word, *Justice*, may, perhaps, be that which ought to have another Name.

Or *at least to be thought false.*

§. 11. But whether or no our *Ideas* of mixed Modes are more liable than any sort, to be different from those of other Men, which are marked

by the same Names: This at least is certain, That *this sort of Falshood is much more familiarly attributed to* our *Ideas* of *mixed Modes, than to any other.* When a Man is thought to have a false *Idea* of *Justice*, or *Gratitude*, or *Glory*, it is for no other Reason, but that his agrees not with the *Ideas* which each of those Names are the Signs of in other Men.

*And why.*

§. 12. *The Reason whereof* seems to me to be this, That the abstract *Ideas* of mixed Modes, being Mens voluntary Combinations of such a precise Collection of simple *Ideas*; and so the Essence of each Species being made by Men alone, whereof we have no other sensible Standard existing any where, but the Name it self, or the Definition of that Name: We have nothing else to refer these our *Ideas* of mixed Modes to, as a Standard, to which we would conform them, but the *Ideas* of those, who are thought to use those Names in their most proper Significations; and so, as our *Ideas* conform, or differ from them, they pass for true or false. And thus much concerning the *Truth* and *Falshood* of our *Ideas*, in Reference to their Names.

*As referred to real Existences, none of our Ideas can be false, but those of Substances.*

§. 13. *Secondly*, As to the *Truth and Falshood of our* Ideas, *in Reference* to the *real Existence* of Things, when that is made the Standard of their Truth, none of them can be termed false, but only complex *Ideas* of Substances.

*First, Simple Ideas in this Sense not false, and why.*

§. 14. *First*, Our simple *Ideas* being barely such Perceptions, as God as fitted us to receive, and given Power to external Objects to produce in us by established Laws and Ways, suitable to his Wisdom and Goodness, though incomprehensible to us, their Truth consists in nothing else but in such Appearances as are produced in us, and must be suitable to those Powers he has placed in external Objects, or else they could not be produced in us: And thus answering those Powers, they are what they should be, *true Ideas.* Nor do they become liable to any Imputation of *Falshood*, if the Mind (as in most Men I believe it does) judges these *Ideas* to be in the Things themselves. For God, in his Wisdom, having set them as Marks of Distinction in Things, whereby we may be able to discern one Thing from another, and so chuse any of them for our Uses, as we have Occasion, it alters not the Nature of our simple *Idea*, whether we think, that the *Idea* of Blue be in the Violet it self, or in our Mind only; and only the Power of producing it be the Texture of its Parts, reflecting the Particles

cles of Light, after a certain Manner, to be in the Violet it self. For that Texture in the Object, by a regular and constant Operation, producing the same *Idea* of Blue in us, it serves us to distinguish, by our Eyes, that from any other Thing, whether that distinguishing Mark, as it is really in the *Violet*, be only a peculiar Texture of Parts, or else that very Colour, the *Idea* whereof (which is in us) is the exact Resemblance. And it is equally from that Appearance to be denominated *Blue*, whether it be that real Colour, or only a peculiar Texture in it, that causes in us that *Idea*: Since the Name *Blue* notes properly nothing, but that Mark of Distinction that is in a *Violet*, discernible only by our Eyes, whatever it consists in, that being beyond our Capacities distinctly to know, and, perhaps, would be of less Use to us, if we had Faculties to discern.

*Though one Man's* Idea *of Blue should be different from another's.*

§. 15. Neither would it carry any Imputation of *Falshood* to our simple *Ideas*, *if* by the different Structure of our Organs, it were so ordered, That *the same Object should produce in several Mens Minds different* Ideas at the same time; *v. g.* if the *Idea* that a *Violet* produced in one Man's Mind by his Eyes, were the same that a *Marigold* produced in another Man's, and *vice versâ*. For since this could never be known; because one Man's Mind could not pass into another Man's Body, to perceive that Appearances were produced by those Organs; neither the *Ideas* hereby, nor the Names would be at all confounded, or any *Falshood* be in either. For all Things that had the Texture of a *Violet*, producing constantly the *Idea* which he called *Blue*; and those which had the Texture of a *Marigold*, producing constantly the *Idea* which he as constantly called *Yellow*, whatever those Appearances were in his Mind, he would be able as regularly to distinguish Things for his Use by those Appearances, and understand and signify those Distinctions, marked by the Names *Blue* and *Yellow*, as if the Appearances, or *Ideas* in his Mind, received from those two Flowers, were exactly the same with the *Idea* in other Mens Minds. I am nevertheless very apt to think, that the sensible *Ideas* produced by any Object in different Mens Minds, are most commonly very near and undiscernibly alike. For which Opinion, I think, there might be many Reasons offer'd: But that being besides my present Business, I shall not trouble my Reader with them; but only Mind him, that the contrary Supposition, if it could be proved, is of little Use, either for the

Improvement of our Knowledge, or Conveniency of Life; and so we need not trouble our selves to examine it.

*First, Simple Ideas in this Sense not false, and why.*

§. 16. From what has been said concerning our simple *Ideas*, I think it evident, That our *simple* Ideas can *none of them* be *false*, *in Respect of Things* existing without us. For the Truth of these Appearances, or Perceptions in our Minds, consisting, as has been said, only in their being answerable to the Powers in external Objects, to produce by our Senses such Appearances in us, and each of them being in the Mind, such as it is, suitable to the Power that produced it, and which alone it represents, it cannot upon that Account, or as referr'd to such a Pattern, be *false*. *Blue* or *Yellow*, *Bitter* or *Sweet*, can never be false *Ideas*, these Perceptions in the Mind are just such as they are there, answering the Powers appointed by God to produce them; and so are truly what they are, and are intended to be. Indeed the Names may be disapply'd; but that in this Respect, makes no Falshood in the *Ideas*: As if a Man ignorant in the *English* Tongue, should call *Purple*, *Scarlet*.

*Secondly, Modes not false.*

§. 17. *Secondly*, *Neither can* our *complex* Ideas *of Modes*, *in Reference to the Essence of any Thing really existing*, *be false*. Because whatever complex *Idea* I have of any Mode, it hath no Reference to any Pattern existing, and made by Nature: It is not supposed to contain in it any other *Ideas*, than what it hath; nor to represent any thing, but such a Complication of *Ideas* as it does. Thus when I have the *Idea* of such an Action of a Man, who forbears to afford himself such Meat, Drink, and Cloathing, and other Conveniencies of Life, as his Riches and Estate will be sufficient to supply, and his Station requires, I have no *false Idea*; but such an one as represents an Action, either as I find or imagine it; and so is capable of neither *Truth*, or *Falshood*. But when I give the Name *Frugality*, or *Vertue*, to this Action, then it may be called a *false Idea*, if thereby it be supposed to agree with that *Idea*, to which, in Propriety of Speech, the Name or *Frugality* doth belong; or to be conformable to that Law, which is the Standard of Vertue and Vice.

*Thirdly, Ideas of Substances when false.*

§. 18. *Thirdly*, Our complex *Ideas of Substances*, *being all referred to Patterns in Things themselves*, *may be false*. That they are all *false*, when looked upon as the Representations of the unknown Essences of Things, is so evident, that there needs nothing to be said of it. I shall therefore pass over that chimerical Supposition,

sition, and consider them as Collections of simple *Ideas* in the Mind, taken from Combinations of simple *Ideas* existing together constantly in Things, of which Patterns they are the supposed Copies: And this Reference of them, to the Existence of Things, they *are false* Ideas. 1. *When* they put together simple *Ideas*, which in the real Existence of Things have no Union; as when to the Shape and Size that exist together in a Horse, is joined, in the same complex *Idea*, the Power of barking like a Dog: Which three *Ideas*, however put together into one in the Mind, were never united in Nature; and this therefore may be called a *false Idea* of an Horse. 2. *Ideas* of Substances are, in this Respect, also *false*, when from any Collection of simple *Ideas* that do always exist together, there is separated, by a direct Negation, any other simple *Idea* which is constantly joined with them. Thus, if to Extension, Solidity, Fusibility, the peculiar Weightiness, and yellow Colour of Gold, any one join in his Thoughts the Negation of a great *or* Degree of Fixedness than is in Lead or Copper, he may be said to have a false complex *Idea*, as well as when he joins to those other simple ones, the *Idea* of perfect absolute Fixedness. For either way, the complex *Idea* of Gold being made up of simple ones as have no Union in Nature, may be termed false. But if he leave out of this his complex *Idea*, that of Fixedness quite, without either actually joining to, or separating of it from the rest in his Mind, it is, I think, to be looked on, as an inadequate and imperfect *Idea*, rather than a *false* one; since though it contains not all the simple *Ideas* that are united in Nature, yet it puts none together but what do really exist together.

*Truth or Falshood always supposes Affirmation or Negation.*

§. 19. Though in Compliance with the ordinary way of Speaking, I have shewed in what Sense, and upon what Ground our *Ideas* may be sometimes called *true*, or *false*; yet if we will look a little nearer into the Matter in all Cases, where any *Idea* is call'd *true*, or *false*, it is from some Judgment that the Mind makes, or is supposed to make, that is *true* or *false*. For *Truth or Falshood*, being *never without some Affirmation or Negation*, express or tacit, it is not to be found, but where Signs are joined or separated, according to the Agreement, or Disagreement of the Things they stand for. The Signs we chiefly use, are either *Ideas*, or Words, wherewith we make either mental or verbal Propositions. *Truth* lies in so joining or separating these Representatives, as the Things they stand for, do in themselves agree or disagree; and *Falshood* in the contrary, as shall be more fully shewed hereafter.

§. 20.

*Ideas in themselves neither true nor false.*

§. 20. Any *Idea* then which we have in our Minds, whether conformable or not to the Existence of Things, or to any *Ideas* in the Minds of other Men, cannot properly for this alone be called *false*. For these Representations, if they have nothing in them, but what is really existing in Things without, cannot be thought *false*, being exact Representations of something: Nor yet if they have any thing in them, differing from the Reality of Things, can they properly be said to be false Representations, or *Ideas* of Things, they do not represent. But the Mistake and *Falshood* is,

*But are false, First, When judged agreeable to another Man's Idea without being so.*

§. 21. *First, When the Mind* having any *Idea*, it *judges* and concludes *it the same that is in other Mens Minds, signified by the same Name*; or that it is conformable to the ordinary received Signification or Definition of that Word, when indeed it is not: Which is the most usual Mistake in mixed Modes, though other *Ideas* also are liable to it.

*Secondly, When judged to agree to real Existence, when they do not.*

§. 22. *Secondy*, When it having a complex *Idea* made up of such a Collection of simple ones, as Nature never puts together, *it judges it to agree to a Species of Creatures really existing*; as when it joins the Weight of Tin to the Colour, Fusibility, and Fixedness of Gold.

*Thirdly, When judged adequate, without being so.*

§. 23. *Thirdly*, When in its complex *Idea*, it has united a certain Number of simple *Ideas*, that do really exist together in some sorts of Creatures, but has also left out others, as much inseparable, *it judges this to be a perfect compleat* Idea, *of a sort of things which really it is not*; *v. g.* having joined the *Ideas* of Substance, yellow, malleable, most heavy, and fusible, it takes that complex *Idea* to be the compleat *Idea* of Gold, when yet its peculiar Fixedness and Solubility in *Aqua Regia*, are as inseparable from those other *Ideas* or Qualities of that Body, as they are one from another.

*Fourthly, When judged to represent the real Essence.*

§. 24. *Fourthly*, The Mistake is yet greater, *when I judge, that this complex* Idea *contains in it the real Essence of any Body existing*; when at least it contains but some few of those Properties which flow from its real Essence and Constitution. I say, only some few of those Properties; for those Properties consisting mostly in the active and passive Powers, it has, in Reference to other Things, all that are

vulgarly

vulgarly known of any one Body, and of which the complex *Idea* of that kind of Things is usually made, are but a very few, in Comparison of what a Man, that has several ways tried and examined it, knows of that one sort of Things; and all that the most expert Man knows, are but few, in Comparison of what are really in that Body, and depend on its internal or essential Constitution. The Essence of a Triangle, lies in a very little Compass, consists in a very few *Ideas*; three Lines including a Space, make up that Essence: But the Properties that flow from this Essence, are more than can be easily known, or enumerated. So I imagine it is in Substances, their real Essences lie in a little Compass; though the Properties flowing from that internal Constitution, are endless.

Ideas, *when false.*

§. 25. To conclude, a Man having no Notion of any Thing without him, but by the *Idea* he has of it in his Mind, (which *Idea* he has a Power to call by what Name he pleases) he may, indeed, make an *Idea* neither answering the Reality of Things, nor agreeing to the *Ideas* commonly signified by other Peoples Words; but cannot make a wrong or *false Idea* of a Thing which is no otherwise known to him, but by the *Idea* he has of it. *v. g.* When I frame an *Idea* of the Legs, Arms, and Body of a Man, and join to this a Horse's Head and Neck, I do not make a *false Idea* of any thing; because it represents nothing without me. But when I call it a *Man*, or *Tartar*, and imagine it either to represent some real Being without me, or to be the same *Idea* that others call by the same Name; in either of these Cases, I may err. And upon this account it is, that it comes to be termed a *false Idea*; though, indeed, the *Falsehood* lies not in the *Idea*, but in that tacit mental Proposition, wherein a Conformity and Resemblance is attributed to it, which it has not. But yet, if having framed such an *Idea* in my Mind, without thinking, either that Existence, or the Name *Man* or *Tartar*, belongs to it, I will call it *Man* or *Tartar*, I may be justly thought fantastical in the Naming; but not erroneous in my Judgment; nor the *Idea* any way *false*.

*More properly to be called Right or Wrong.*

§. 26 Upon the whole Matter, I think, That our *Ideas*, as they are considered by the Mind, either in Reference to the proper Signification of their Names, or in Reference to the Reality of Things, *may* very fitly *be called right or wrong* Ideas, according as they agree or disagree to those Patterns to which they are referred. But if any one had rather call them *true* or *false*,

*false*, 'tis fit he use a Liberty, which every one has, to call Things by those Names he thinks best; though in Propriety of Speech, *Truth* or *Falshood*, will, I think, scarce agree to them, but as they, some way or other, vertually contain in them some mental Proposition. The *Ideas* that are in a Man's Mind, simply considered, cannot be wrong, unless complex ones, wherein inconsistent Parts are jumbled together. All other *Ideas* are in themselves right; and the Knowledge about them, right and true Knowledge: But when we come to refer them to any thing, as to their Patterns and Archetypes, then they are capable of being wrong, as far as they disagree with such Archetypes.

## CHAP. XXXIII.

### *Of the Association of* Ideas.

*Something unreasonable in most Men.*

§. 1. THere is scarce any one that does not observe something that seems odd to him, and is in it self really extravagant in the Opinions, Reasonings, and Actions of other Men. The least Flaw of this kind, if at all different from his own, every one is quick-sighted enough to espy in another, and will by the Authority of Reason forwardly condemn, though he be guilty of much greater Unreasonableness in his own Tenets and Conduct, which he never perceives, and will very hardly, if at all, be convinced of.

*Not wholly from Self-love.*

§. 2. This proceeds not wholly from Self-love, though that has often a great Hand in it. Men of fair Minds, and not given up to the over-weening of Self flattery, are frequently guilty of it; and in many Cases one with Amazement hears the Arguings, and is astonish'd at the Obstinacy of a worthy Man, who yields not to the Evidence of Reason, though laid before him as clear as Day-light.

*Nor from Education,*

§. 3. This sort of Unreasonableness is usually imputed to Education and Prejudice, and for the most part truly enough, though that reaches not the bottom of the Disease, nor shews distinctly enough whence it rises, or wherein it lies. Education is often rightly assigned for the Cause, and Prejudice is a good general

Name

Name for the thing it self: But yet, I think, he ought to look a little farther, who would trace this sort of Madness to the Root it springs from, and so explain it, as to shew whence this Flaw has its Original in very sober and rational Minds, and wherein it consists.

*A degree of Madness.*

§. 4. I shall be pardon'd for calling it by so harsh a Name as *Madness*, when it is considered, that Opposition to Reason deserves that Name, and is really Madness; and there is scarce a Man so free from it, but that if he should always, on all Occasions, argue or do as in some Cases he constantly does, would not be thought fitter for *Bedlam*, than Civil Conversation. I do not here mean when he is under the Power of an unruly Passion, but in the steady calm Course of his Life. That which will yet more apologize for this harsh Name, and ungrateful Imputation on the greatest part of Mankind is, that enquiring a little by the by into the Nature of Madness, *B.* 2. *c.* 11. §. 13. I found it to spring from the very same Root, and to depend on the very same Cause we are here speaking of. This Consideration of the thing it self, at a time when I thought not the least on the Subject which I am now treating of, suggested it to me. And if this be a Weakness to which all Men are so liable; if this be a Taint which so universally infects Mankind, the greater Care should be taken to lay it open under its due Name, thereby to excite the greater Care in its Prevention and Cure.

*From a wrong Connexion of* Ideas.

§. 5. Some of our *Ideas* have a natural Correspondence and Connexion one with another: It is the Office and Excellency of our Reason to trace these, and hold them together in that Union and Correspondence which is founded in their peculiar Beings. Besides this, there is another Connexion of *Ideas* wholly owing to Chance or Custom; *Ideas* that in themselves are not at all of kin, come to be so united in some Mens Minds, that 'tis very hard to separate them, they always keep in Company, and the one no sooner at any time comes into the Understanding, but its Associate appears with it; and if they are more than two, which are thus united, the whole Gang, always inseparable, shew themselves together.

*This Connexion how made.*

§. 6. This strong Combination of *Ideas*, not ally'd by Nature, the Mind makes in it self either voluntarily, or by Chance; and hence it comes in different Men to be very different, according to

their

their different Inclinations, Educations, Interests, *&c.* Custom settles Habits of Thinking in the Understanding, as well as of determining in the Will, and of Motions in the Body; all which seems to be but Trains of Motion in the Animal Spirits, which once set a going, continue in the same Steps they have been used to, which by often treading, are worn into a smooth Path, and the Motion in it becomes easy, and as it were natural. As far as we can comprehend Thinking, thus *Ideas* seem to be produced in our Minds; or if they are not, this may serve to explain their following one another in an habitual Train, when once they are put into that Tract, as well as it does to explain such Motions of the Body. A Musician used to any Tune, will find, that let it but once begin in his Head, the *Ideas* of the several Notes of it will follow one another orderly in his Understanding, without any Care or Attention, as regularly as his Fingers move orderly over the Keys of the Organ to play out the Tune he has begun, though his unattentive Thoughts be elsewhere a wandering. Whether the natural Cause of these *Ideas*, as well as of that regular Dancing of his Fingers, be the Motion of his Animal Spirits, I will not determine, how probable soever, by this Instance, it appears to be so: But this may help us a little to conceive of intellectual Habits, and of the tying together of *Ideas*.

*Some Antipathies an effect of it.*

§. 7. That there are such Associations of them made by Custom in the Minds of most Men, I think no Body will question, who has well consider'd himself or others; and to this, perhaps, might be justly attributed most of the Sympathies and Antipathies observable in Men, which work as strongly, and produce as regular Effects as if they were natural, and are therefore called so, though they at first had no other Original but the accidental Connexion of two *Ideas*, which either the Strength of the first Impression, or future Indulgence so united, that they always afterwards kept Company together in that Man's Mind, as if they were but one *Idea*. I say, most of the Antipathies, I do not say all, for some of them are truly natural, depend upon our original Constitution, and are born with us; but a great part of those which are counted natural, would have been known to be from unheeded, though, perhaps, early Impressions, or wanton Phancies at first, which would have been acknowledged the Original of them, if they had been warily observed. A grown Person surfeiting with Honey, no sooner hears the Name of it, but his Phancy immediately carries

Sickness

Sickness and Qualms to his Stomach, and he cannot bear the very *Idea* of it; other *Ideas* of Dislike, and Sickness, and Vomiting, presently accompany it, and he is disturb'd, but he knows from whence to date this Weakness, and can tell how he got this Indisposition: Had this happen'd to him by an over Dose of Honey, when a Child, all the same Effects would have followed, but the Cause would have been mistaken, and the Antipathy counted natural.

§. 8. I mention this not out of any great Necessity there is in this present Argument, to distinguish nicely between natural and acquired Antipathies, but I take notice of it for another Purpose, (*viz.*) that those who have Children, or the Charge of their Education, would think it worth their while diligently to watch, and carefully to prevent the undue Connexion of *Ideas* in the Minds of young People. This is the Time most susceptible of lasting Impressions; and though those relating to the Health of the Body, are by discreet People minded and fenced against, yet I am apt to doubt, that those which relate more peculiarly to the Mind, and terminate in the Understanding, or Passions, have been much less heeded than the thing deserves; nay, those relating purely to the Understanding, have, as I suspect, been by most Men wholly overlook'd.

*A great Cause of Errors.*

§. 9. This wrong Connexion in our Minds of *Ideas* in themselves, loose and independent one of another, as such an Influence, and is of so great Force to set us awry in our Actions, as well Moral as Natural, Passions, Reasonings, and Notions themselves, that perhaps there is not any one thing that deserves more to be looked after.

*Instances.*

§. 10. The *Ideas* of *Goblines* and *Sprights*, have really no more to do with Darkness, than Light; yet let but a foolish Maid inculcate these often on the Mind of a Child, and raise them there together, possibly he shall never be able to separate them again so long as he lives, but Darkness shall ever afterwards bring with it those frightful *Ideas*, and they shall be so joined, that he can no more bear the one than the other.

§. 11. A Man receives a sensible Injury from another, thinks on the Man and that Action over and over, and by ruminating on them strongly, or much in his Mind, so cements those two *Ideas* together, that he makes them almost one; never thinks on the Man, but the Pain and Displeasure he suffered, comes into his Mind with it, so that he scarce distinguishes them,

them, but has as much an Aversion for the one as the other. Thus Hatreds are often begotten from slight and almost innocent Occasions, and Quarrels propagated and continued in the World.

§. 12. A Man has suffered Pain or Sickness in any Place, he saw his Friend die in such a Room; though these have in Nature nothing to do one with another, yet when the *Idea* of the Place occurs to his Mind, it brings (the Impression being once made) that of the Pain and Displeasure with it, he confounds them in his Mind, and can as little bear the one as the other.

*Why Time cures some Disorders in the Mind which Reason cannot.*

§. 13. When this Combination is settled, and whilst it lasts, it is not in the Power of Reason to help us, and relieve us from the Effects of it. *Ideas* in our Minds, when they are there, will operate according to their Natures and Circumstances; and here we see the Cause why Time cures certain Affections, which Reason, though in the right, and allow'd to be so, has not Power over, nor is able against them to prevail with those who are apt to hearken to it in other Cases. The Death of a Child, that was the daily Delight of his Mother's Eyes, and Joy of her Soul, rends from her Heart the whole Comfort of her Life, and gives her all the Torment imaginable: Use the Consolations of Reason in this Case, and you were as good preach Ease to one on the Rack, and hope to allay, by rational Discourses, the Pain of his Joints tearing asunder. Till time has by Disuse separated the Sense of that Enjoyment, and its Loss from the *Idea* of the Child returning to her Memory, all Representations, though never so reasonable, are in vain; and therefore some in whom the Union between these *Ideas* is never dissolved, spend their Lives in Mourning, and carry an incurable Sorrow to their Graves.

*Farther Instances of the Effect of the Association of* Ideas.

§. 14. A Friend of mine knew one perfectly cured of Madness by a very harsh and offensive Operation. The Gentleman, who was thus recovered, with great Sense of Gratitude and Acknowledgment, owned the Cure all his Life after, as the greatest Obligation he could have received; but whatever Gratitude and Reason suggested to him, he could never bear the Sight of the Operator: That Image brought back with it the *Idea* of that Agony which he suffer'd from his Hands, which was too mighty and intolerable for him to endure.

§. 15.

§. 15. Many Children imputing the Pain they endured at School to their Books they were corrected for, so join those *Ideas* together, that a Book becomes their Aversion, and they are never reconciled to the Study and Use of them all their Lives after; and thus Reading becomes a Torment to them, which otherwise possibly they might have made the great Pleasure of their Lives. There are Rooms convenient enough, that some Men cannot Study in, and Fashions of Vessels, which though never so clean and commodious, they cannot Drink out of, and that by Reason of some accidental *Ideas* which are annexed to them, and make them offensive; and who is there that hath not observed some Man to flag at the Appearance, or in the Company of some certain Person not otherwise superior to him; but because having once on some occasion got the Ascendant, the *Idea* of Authority and Distance goes along with that of the Person, and he that has been thus subjected, is not able to separate them.

§. 16. Instances of these kind are so plentiful every-where, that if I add one more, it is only for the pleasant Oddness of it. It is of a young Gentleman, who having learnt to Dance, and that to great Perfection, there happened to stand an old Trunk in the Room where he learnt. The *Idea* of this remarkable piece of Houshold-Stuff, had so mixed it self with the Turns and Steps of all his Dances, that though in that Chamber he could Dance excellently well, yet it was only whilst that Trunk was there, nor could he perform well in any other place, unless that, or some such other Trunk had its due Position in the Room. If this Story shall be suspected to be dressed up with some comical Circumstances, a little beyond precise Nature; I answer for my self, that I had it some Years since from a very sober and worthy Man, upon his own Knowledge, as I report it; and I dare say, there are very few inquisitive Persons, who read this, who have not met with Accounts, if not Examples of this Nature, that may parallel, or at least justify this.

*Its Influence on intellectual Habits.*

§. 17. Intellectual Habits and Defects this way contracted, are not less frequent and powerful, though less observed. Let the *Ideas* of Being and Matter be strongly joined either by Education or much Thought, whilst these are still combined in the Mind, what Notions, what Reasonings, will there be about separate Spirits? Let Custom from the very Childhood, have join'd Figure and

Shape to the *Idea* of God, and what Absurdities will that Mind be liable to about the Deity?

Let the *Idea* of Infallibility be inseparably join'd to any Person, and these two constantly together possess the Mind, and then one Body, in two Places at once, shall unexamined be swallowed for a certain Truth, by an implicit Faith, when ever that imagin'd infallible Person dictates and demands Assent without Enquiry.

*Observable in different Sects.*

§. 18. Some such wrong and unnatural Combinations of *Ideas* will be found to establish the irreconcilable Opposition between different Sects of Philosophy and Religion; for we cannot imagine every one of their Followers to impose wilfully on himself, and Knowingly refuse Truth offer'd by plain Reason. Interest, though it does a great deal in the Case, yet cannot be thought to work whole Societies of Men to so universal a Perverseness, as that every one of them to a Man should knowingly maintain Falshood: Some at least must be allow'd to do what all pretend to, *i. e.* to pursue Truth sincerely; and therefore there must be something that blinds their Understandings, and makes them not see the Falshood of what they embrace for real Truth. That which thus captivates their Reasons, and leads Men of Sincerity blindfold for common Sense, will, when examin'd, be found to be what we are speaking of: Some independent *Ideas*, of no Alliance to one another, are by Education, Custom, and the constant Din of their Party, so coupled in their Minds, that they always appear there together, and they can no more separate them in their Thoughts, than if they were but one *Idea*, and they operate as if they were so. This gives Sense to *Jargon*, Demonstration to Absurdities, and Consistency to Nonsense, and is the Foundation of the greatest, I had almost said, of all the Errors in the World; or if it does not reach so far, it is at least the most dangerous one, since so far as it obtains, it hinders Men from seeing and examining. When two things in themselves disjoined, appear to the Sight constantly united; if the Eye sees these things riveted, which are loose, where will you begin to rectify the Mistakes that follow in two *Ideas*, that they have been accustom'd so to join in their Minds, as to substitute one for the other, and, as I am apt to think, often without perceiving it themselves? This, whilst they are under the Deceit of it, makes them uncapable of Conviction, and they applaud themselves as zealous Champions for Truth, when indeed they are contending for Error; and

and the Confusion of two different *Ideas*, which a customary Connexion of them in their Minds hath to them made in Effect but one, fills their Heads with false Views, and their Reasonings with false Consequences.

*Conclusion.*

§. 19. Having thus given an Account of the Original, Sorts, and Extent of our *Ideas*, with several other Considerations, about these (I know not whether I may say) Instruments, or Materials, of our Knowledge; the Method I at first proposed to my self, would now require, that I should immediately proceed to shew, what Use the Understanding makes of them, and what Knowledge we have by them. This was that, which, in the first general View I had of this Subject, was all that I thought I should have to do: But upon a nearer Approach, I find, that there is so close a Connexion between *Ideas* and Words; and our abstract *Ideas*, and general Words have so constant a Relation one to another, that it is impossible to speak clearly and distinctly of our Knowledge, which all consists in Propositions, without considering, first, the Nature, Use, and Signification of Language; which therefore must be the Business of the next Book.

---

*The End of the First Volume.*

---